
YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Sure. I'll start the recording now and start the roll call.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team monthly call taking place on Thursday, 26th of May 2016 at 19:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, León Sanchez, Sandra Hoferichter, and Julie Hammer.

Currently we don't have any apologies. And Tijani has just joined as well.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Ariel Liang, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar.

Finally, I would like to remind everyone to state their name while speaking for the transcript purposes. Over to you Alan, thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. And my name is Alan for the transcript purposes. The first item is, the meeting is scheduled at 90 minutes, I've managed to fill it up with the agenda, but I hope I've been generous. So we may end early, I would like to, but that prediction is rarely fall through with the reality. But let's try.

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 item is the ALAC policy development activities. I don't think there has been any change since the ALAC meeting, but I'll turn it over to Ms. Liang.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Mr. Alan Greenberg, and this is Ariel Liang for the record. The only change is León Sanchez has volunteered to draft a statement in response to the public comment on revisions to ICANN standards of behaviors. That's the only change.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was delighted to see that, thank you León. All right, next item. Yes, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, just a very brief, if I may use the word shout out to Ariel, for managing, in her professional way, eight current votes going on right now. So that's an incredible number, just wanted to mention that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Consider it mentioned and consider Ariel thanked.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Heidi, thank you all.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we have several applauses in our Adobe Connect room. The next item on our agenda is the CWG CCWG status update. I am un-delighted to report that both of my comments that I submitted were categorically refused.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What?

ALAN GREENBERG: What-what? Hasn't everyone studied the new bylaws? Other than the, according to the bylaws, the RDS review will be delayed if the SSR review is scheduled. I'm presuming that is a typo. But maybe it isn't. I was particularly perturbed that the, one of the rationales was in the comment I made about the eligibility for being considered for a Board position that the empowered community administration person could not run.

And one of the rationales, the first rationale given was, I meant, I talked about liaison selection processes, which weren't mentioned in the CCWG and therefore, was not valid for consideration. I, of course, only mentioned liaison appointment processes because in their whole section of the bylaw, which we were talking about, which was not in the CCWG proposal, they mentioned liaisons.

However, I'm tired of fighting things. Olivier, yes, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I've read through the document, the staff response to the comments. I must say, I'm equally as disappointed, and I have noticed that the only instances of modifications or amendments were just either typos, grammatical changes, or just the addition of one or two words, depending on any ambiguity.

So for example, if it speaks about the, some committee or something, then it will just say well, if it's just supposed to be the Board committee, then it would have to add Board at every instance of that sentence, so that it would just make sure that it would be the Board committee, and not just any committee.

I don't know, it smells of being something that was done in a lot of haste, and I do have concerns about this. And I'm equally as disappointed that both of your mentions, and also the one, I think, that Holly made, were all refused.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed. Hold on a second, just give me a moment.

Part of the disappointment was the summary, including the in-depth analysis, came out two and a half hours after the close of the comment period. So well, anyway.

Sorry, and the revised bylaws. So... Yes, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I may add, Alan, it's Olivier speaking. That's not so bad, because I'm sure, I think that they must have been reading the comments as they came in, and they filled in the boxes, as the comments came in.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm presuming so. Nevertheless, I was somewhat disappointed. The largest part of it is, it essentially says they are not violating, but going against the confidentiality of the NomCom process. That if someone, if a chair wants to apply through the NomCom for a position, for a position on the Board, they essentially have to resign ahead of time, serving notice that they're applying to a confidential process.

I find that somewhat upsetting. But anyway, so be it. Any other comments on the overall process? Is León on the call? Does he have any comments? León is probably on two calls right now, so I'm not sure where he's listening.

Not seeing anyone have a hand up, I'm assuming this item is closed. Next item, ICANN 56, scheduled review of planning. I'll turn it over to start with... Yes, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, it's Olivier. Sorry for being a nuisance. I was just going to ask you, on the follow-up of the CCWG CWG. So the implementation and all of this. I understand there has been calls. Is there anything to note on this? Because I've obviously missed those.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think so. There was one... I'm trying to remember now. Cheryl, there was one item that I thought might be worthy of mention, but I can't remember what it is, from one of the implementation oversight groups.

Ah yes, it's the issue of staff being seconding to PTI instead of being staff of PTI. And there is some significant push back. Part of it is being accepted that, you know... One of the rationales is, do staff themselves do not feel comfortable being pushed off into a different company and no longer being ICANN staff?

And therefore, perhaps it's acceptable. The stability of IANA is probably, you know, purpose number one at this point, but that resulted in a suggestion by some people that fine, the current staff can be seconded, but any future staff should be hired by this other company, essentially having two different categories of staff members in the future.

And I, you know, that may blow up in our face at this point. I think seconding staff makes sense on several different levels, and one of the reasons people are saying it shouldn't be done, that the staff should be owned by PTI, is for separation, but I actually look at it a completely reverse way to that.

If we ever have to move IANA to some other group, other than PTI, and essentially cancel the PTI contract and create a new contract with someone else, it's a plus to have the staff being ICANN staff, because if indeed the staff are not the problem, and we choose to use the same staff, that gives ICANN the ability of seconding them or whatever to this

new group. Whereas if they're PTI employees, that may not be a possibility at all. So I actually see it as a plus for separation, if separation were to ever happen. But there has been a lot of pushback on it, so I'm not quite sure where that is going to go.

It may blow up in our face and become a real substantive problem. Certainly a number of people, Avri among them, are likely to not accept what we're talking about right now. Olivier and then Cheryl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And the last question on the CSE, the appointments of liaison, have you given any thought about this?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's later on in the agenda. We have a fair amount of time. The deadline we're being asked to meet is 27th of July, I think. The formal invitation has not yet gone out, but we have a fair amount of time on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND So I couldn't see it. We don't have scrolling for this. If we could have scrolling enabled, that would be helpful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Scrolling is enabled on my screen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're running the show.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, I'm not... I am a host. I don't like being a host, because then when I scroll, other people's screens move. In any case, yes it is on the agenda later on, but just as a brief mention that there is one of the appointments we're going to have to make, we're under no obligation to make an appointment, but I would not see why we wouldn't if we have someone with the right skills who is interested in doing it.

Cheryl, go ahead.

We cannot hear you yet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you hear me or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you. You're sort of faint, but I can actually hear your voice.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've got my microphone on, and I don't know why you're not hearing me. But anyway...

ALAN GREENBERG: I am hearing you now.

Cheryl, try again please.

We seem to have lost Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is that any better?

ALAN GREENBERG: I just heard, “Is that any better?”. It’s very, very faint, but we can make it out, if you keep on talking, let’s see if we can interrupt it.

I think she said it’s too difficult.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl says she’s going to give up. All right, anyone else have any comments? We’re back on the CWG CCWG at this point. Anyone else have any further comments?

I think Cheryl’s problem is she’s on two different calls and can’t get dial outs on the same phone on both calls.

All right. Hearing nothing, let us go onto ICANN 56. And I’m presuming Gisella and/or Heidi, depending on who has bandwidth, will be talking about the schedule first. Before they start, I’ll point out this schedule has been hell to work out. I think it’s in good shape right now, and we have a lot of hours of ALAC time to look at.

We've come up with a new acronym, that's the At-Large Leadership, and that includes ALAC and the regional leaders. Acronym ALL, which we are not using at the moment, but we have about, at this point, about 12 hours allocated that we now have to fill, and we'll be talking about that in a few minutes.

Gisella or Heidi, as you wish.

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, would you like me to just run through the schedule first, and then I'll let you take over with content?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, absolutely, thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much, Alan. Gisella here. As you said, the schedule is, I think we're pretty much there. And I'm just going to again run through it, and apologies for not putting the ALT one up, which is actually with the, with a few extras on it. That's due to my broadband issue. So, starting on Monday morning, we're going to try and organize an ALT breakfast.

Please just stay tuned, I will send you a little notice to save the date, and we'll work on logistics over the next couple of weeks. Then you may have heard on the ALAC call, on Monday the format of the 89 welcome coffee and registration, which is basically going to be in the main area of the conference center.

We're going to have the registration and a welcome coffee for the first half an hour, and for the second half an hour, David Olive and [inaudible] will be speaking to us with a microphone. So I'm not quite sure how that's going to work out, but that is the format of the 89 session.

And then we're going to go to the At-Large leadership working session, one and two over lunch, we've got both the ALAC and GAC meetings. And my understanding today is that we, it's not limited to the ALAC, but we're working on numbers because we will have all going well lunch with the GAC [inaudible] lunchboxes.

The, well running parallel to the At-Large leadership morning session is the At-Large outreach and engagement session with NextGen, which was briefly discussed on today's outreach and engagement call, which will then be followed by the session with the Fellows.

Again, we will be working on the agenda for both of these sessions to make sure there is lots of meat on the bone, and it keeps everyone engaged. Monday evening, reception at City Hall by the City of Helsinki. Tuesday, nothing much has changed there except for the meeting of the ALAC and the IPC, running parallel with the At-Large regional [inaudible] meeting, sorry yes, they're still running parallel on the Tuesday afternoon.

The community sessions remain as is, with no ALAC sessions against those. The evening, we've got an hour's cocktail which is the President's Reception, which we'll have in conjunction with the EURALO and Civil Society networking event. Again, meeting B, what they've

decided to do here was on the Tuesday and the Wednesday, is to have two cocktails where everyone can also have their corner, as opposed to having three separate cocktails like we sometimes have at the beginning of the meetings.

We will have signage there, we will hopefully have the pop-up banner, and we'll make whatever signage is relevant would be joint networking event. As Olivier mentioned earlier on the outreach and engagement session earlier today, there will be a jamming session later, off-site. So we're still working of finalizing details for that, and they would be forwarded in due course.

On the Wednesday, we have the working sessions. Again, At-Large Leadership working session in the morning. We have an outreach and engagement working group meeting there, and why the working group meeting is there as opposed to the third slot in the morning, is that Alan will no doubt need to attend a new GNSO sessions that morning, as well as possibly some other ALAC members, which I don't know off the top of my head, but I do have that written down.

We have the At-Large reviewing party lunch, with the independent examiners and Rinalia, over the lunch break. Again, exact timings and location to be confirmed, but it has been submitted. Afternoon, we've got the AFRALO meeting running parallel with the NARALO meeting, and we've got there, if you can read, holding slot, that only means that we've put an additional, an hour and a half in, for the At-Large regional leadership work session, which if need be, we can use for something else.

You know how it gets, it really gets really busy closer to the time and we never have any other leeway with any other meetings. But if not, it will no doubt be filled. We are aware there are two sessions running...

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, if I can interrupt. Just as... Some people understand the code words. If a lunch session says lunch, then lunch is provided. If it's a meeting, there is no lunch provided.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yeah, except for the ALAC and GAC, which is in the process of changing, but which will be updated accordingly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please tell. This is the first I've heard about that.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, because it's being toing and froing with GAC support staff today.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we may be fed for that?

GISELLA GRUBER: You may get a box.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure a box is better than going to the lunch counter, but okay...

GISELLA GRUBER: That's why [CROSSTALK]... I'm not going to get you all excited, I have ordered a better lunch for the review working party, but we'll see, and I will [inaudible] closest to the time. I don't want to get anyone excited.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Back to you Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: On the Wednesday afternoon, the holding slot is in parallel with the country and other geographic names forum, that is the name that is started being used for that one. As well as the PDP review of all rights protection mechanisms in the gTLDs. As we said, it may be filled, not necessarily, but we never have the luxury of having a slot that we can play with.

And then in the evening, there is the Chairman's reception. Again, this is an hour cocktail from 6:30 to 7:30. With, you know, smaller groups will no doubt be meeting as well. I'm not sure to what extent the

Chairman will be making a speech in that cocktail, nor the President in the night before, but I'm waiting, pardon me, on confirmation.

Going on to the last day of meeting which is the Thursday, two working groups working parallel in the morning, the At-Large leadership work sessions, with the wrap-up, and then the afternoon cross community working sessions. We've come to a total of 12 and a half hours of At-Large working sessions. And please note that on two of the days, we do go into half an hour of the lunch session, so on the Tuesday and the Thursday, we'll only have one hour over lunch.

Any comments or questions?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I'll add the caveat of that is, of course, we always can reduce that last half hour, should we be overflowing with time. On the Monday or Tuesday session, which is listed as ISOCers, but from what Olivier was saying, since the jam session follows that, I'm assuming that is open to all, not just to ISOC people, is that correct?

GISELLA GRUBER:

I'll let Olivier respond to that. Just my response to that one, is that from what I've seen, is that it's not an ICANN ISOC event, it is actually the ISOC [inaudible] ISOC Finland organizing an event. So that's not an ICANN open event. I don't know how the invitations will be sent out, but because it's going to be at the same venue as the jamming session, I know we are restricted on people.

But I have a feeling that it is limited to possibly on invitation from [inaudible], from ISOC Finland. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Gisella. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I have no further information, a part from a maximum number of people that we can have there, it is between 120 and 150. I would imagine that we're not going to turn so many people away. We would really have to ask [inaudible] how they're going to be dealing with the ISOC part, in the early part of the evening.

Certainly the jam session will be open to absolutely anyone who wants to come.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Holly, go ahead.

Cannot hear you, Holly.

Holly has put down her hand.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm asking if Friday is still on?

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't we hear from Heidi as to what is planned for Friday? I may have missed it when we just started, but I don't know to what extent we

talked about the current plans for the breakfast on Monday, either. So if someone could review both of those, I would appreciate it.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, Heidi if I may, just quickly, Holly, Gisella here. I'm not ignoring your email. I'll respond to your email, of which one of the questions is the Friday morning session. With regards to the breakfast, and that just boils down to the logistics on the Monday morning. We are going to be in different hotels again, scattered around Helsinki, and I'm waiting for the final rooming list, but the ALAC is likely to be a 15 minute walk from the convention center.

Again, I'm working on... If I'm told there is a tram just to make sure there is actually a tram stop, the idea would be to find the closest hotel to the conference center, and to have a breakfast there from about seven to quarter of eight, or possibly could have past seven until eight o'clock, and then move on to the convention center, bearing in mind that the 8 to 8:30 at the convention center is for registration and coffee, which we will have already had the coffee.

And I'll look into registration, where we can pick up ICANN badges, but we're thinking that the security is going to be the same as Marrakech, and Marrakech was just the first of the new security in place during the meeting, which is picking up a badge with your ID where you have to pick it up in person. That's why I need to respond to those questions before I can confirm the timing of the breakfast, location of the breakfast, but we are thinking of at least fully five minute breakfast on the Monday morning.

And we, with regard to the logistics of the Friday morning, again, I'm looking at which hotel we can have a private dining room or private area to hold the meeting, on the Friday morning, from, I've put 8 to 12, but I think Alan can tell us if it's 8 to 12 or 9 to 12, if you want a three or four hour meeting. That's an update on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

In terms of timing that one, if it's a room associated with a restaurant, we might be forced to vacate in time for them to set up for lunch. So my preference would be to go to 12, but you know, and start later if we don't need the full time, but let's play that one by ear at this point.

Question though, the last I heard about the 8 to 9 session on Monday, was that this was going to be an open area with coffee, but the last half hour would be taken over to speeches including the Ethos Award presentation. Is that still what is being discussed?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, Gisella here. From what I've heard, yes. We happen to have had confirmation on Ethos Award, but yes, the second half an hour will be, David, [Yuran?], and possibly the Ethos Aware running from 8:30 until 9.

ALAN GREENBERG:

In an open area with people getting coffee and talking to each other?

GISELLA GRUBER: Absolutely. That's what, [inaudible] as far as I'm concerned, when it comes to an open area and people talking, but that's what I've heard, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did make a comment about the Mad Hatter running things before. All right, let me ask a question to this group. A 45 minute breakfast, at a table in a general breakfast area, with, if we look at the ALT, plus the liaisons, plus a few staff members, we're talking about at least 12 people or so, we may as well not have it.

You know, between the time it takes to get the breakfast, and to be eating, and there is no way to talk so that everyone can hear in that kind of room, I'm just not sure that is worth even going to the hassle of having. But I would like other people's input on it.

Nobody? While people are thinking about it, Julie, you have your hand up.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Alan. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. Just an observation in looking at the schedule for ALAC and the schedule for SSAC on this meeting, I'm not sure with Olivier and

Maureen [inaudible], but I'm going to have much less time with ALAC then I would normally would because with the type of meeting, the ALAC is scheduling a lot more time within its planned sessions, and normally [inaudible]... So my observation is that I probably won't get to too many ALAC sessions this time, much less than normal.

So interesting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's where your priority has to be, I think. I think those are our rules. I have a question for you Julie, though. When we started talking about community sessions, one of the people who smiled largest about it was Patrick, because he said that's an opportunity, so he doesn't have to give the same presentation six times, but can give it all at once.

That, of course, didn't happen. We never scheduled a SSAC ALAC meeting. Somehow we talked about it at one point, but it fell through the cracks. Is there something on the books that really means we should still try to do it? Or is... Go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER:

I suspect that, yeah, actually, it had got me. I suspect that if there are any issues that if SSAC had put out reports about in the intervening period since the last meeting, but that would necessarily brief on. Yeah, there won't be a SSAC public briefing, because that's not really part of the current schedule.

If you think it is worthwhile time to schedule a SSAC meeting, I can see whether there is still room in the schedule, but I suspect that it's getting a bit late for both ALAC and SSAC.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, as I said, we do have a fair number of hours allocated to ALAC, so we can chop out an hour from that, if you think there is something which really, you know, we don't want to miss the opportunity for. So can I ask you to take home an action item, to look at what reports have come out, or what you know will be coming out before then, and is there anything that, you know, that really warrants taking the time and trying to fit it into your agenda, as well as ours?

I'm happy to skip it. I don't think we're going to forget about each other just because we don't meet at one meeting. So I'm not worried about breaking the trend. But take it home, and let's discuss it offline and we'll make an adjustment if necessary.

JULIE HAMMER:

Will do.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. The comments, when I asked the question of, should we bother with the Monday morning breakfast? You know, I feel really, I think it's really unfortunate that the ALT will not have an opportunity to meet unless we decide to do it at midnight the night before. But I really don't see, other than as a social event, what the purpose of the breakfast will be.

Now, I don't mind it as a social event. We have to eat breakfast somewhere. But... Go ahead Tijani.

Can't hear you yet.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I put a green mark to agree with you, but you didn't count enough seats, that's why I'm taking the floor to tell you, breakfast of 45 minutes with 12 people in a public area, is not useful at all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so. That's my sense of the thing, so we will decide where we'll have breakfast for people who want to be there socially, but to be honest, I'm not sure it's worth doing as a meeting. How we're going to recover from it, I don't know. I suspect... I don't know when people are starting to travel. Is there anyone starting to travel before Thursday?

I've got to go to the door, so I can't see if you have a hand up, so if anyone has an answer, just speak up.

No? Okay. Can we have an action to try and schedule a Doodle for an hour, hour and a half meeting, probably won't need an hour and a half,

but let's try to schedule an ALT meeting as late as possible before people leave, and we'll try to cover it that way.

All right. Next item on the agenda, key topics for discussion. I would like one or two volunteers to start putting together the topic list. We have to deliver it, Heidi, Tuesday, Wednesday next week? Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

This is Heidi. Well the topics will be nice if we can have a little bit today, just so I can submit those topics to the people who are planning the pre-call webinar, but the topics themselves are really for us as we move forward, that the agenda, the schedule, the meetings have been scheduled, and now go into the agenda setting. So that's why I put that item on the agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, no, but that's why you put it there, but that's not why I am discussing it. You and I will come up with some topics for the webinar, I'm not worried about that right now. I would like one or two people, and you know, I don't much care who it is, but I would like someone who would deliver on it to start putting together the topic list of what it is we should be talking about.

As I said, we have a lot of hours scheduled, as it normally is, Heidi and I do it together, and I really think other people should be involved to try to make sure that we're talking about things that everyone thinks is important. So I would ask for, do we have two volunteers to start

putting together that list? I'll start naming people if we don't see some volunteers.

Then I will assign it to the two vice-chairs, León and Tijani.

I'm not sure if they're listening, they haven't moaned, I haven't seen tick marks.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I'm sorry, I was...

ALAN GREENBERG: You were on your other call.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yeah. So what was that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have assigned to you and Tijani the responsibility of putting together the first list of topics to be discussed within the ALAC and regional leaders' meetings.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Excellent.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Next, Tijani, you've moved to the top of the list so I suspect your hand is up. I can't see it because your tick mark is covering it, but if you would like to speak, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Alan, I would like to speak, and I would like to ask when you want this list ready?

ALAN GREENBERG: You don't want me to say yesterday, of course. We have to have a pretty firm schedule the week before the meeting. And well, I take that back. Heidi and Gisella, when will you start cursing if you don't have something ready for translation?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We need it may be the first or second week, latest, of June. Please do not wait until the last week. We're all travelling, etc. so really, I would like to send it end of next week, frankly, honestly, so we can start putting together the agendas on the Wiki pages and getting everything ready to go. As you know, they take several iterations to get to the final agenda, so we need to get some topics down on paper.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, first pass by the end of next week.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, very good. So I will try to work with León and have something ready by the next week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. It's really just a matter of, you know, you don't even have to talk, just send emails back and forth, and try to cover the various things. And I'll send you a wish list of things that I think have to be on the agenda for one reason or another. You'll probably cover them anyway, but just as a double check.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if you haven't gotten something from me by the end of this week, bug me, but I'll put it on my to-do list.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hello? This is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, the next point on this topic is basically, if we could ask you to think about what kinds of contribution do you expect to make, or what kind of aim would have for the cross community discussions that would be happening in Helsinki?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give you my personal aim. You're going to consider it somewhat of a negative comment. My aim is that when we finish them, I will not have felt that we wasted our time. I don't know if anyone else has any thoughts. We're allocating something like 12 hours in the afternoons to have these cross community working sessions.

We are probably going to be allocating at least five or six of them, that we will not schedule anything them against, and the question is, what do other people think we're going to gain all of these? I still see a fair number of comments saying we still don't understand quite what they're going to be for, or how they will be done.

And that includes the session that I'm partly chairing.

No one has any comments, thoughts? Heidi, your hand is still up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes it is, again. So I wanted to let you know that the current thinking for the pre-meeting webinar, that staff usually need, is that the first half, if not longer, will be an introduction to those cross community sessions, led by the team that are down as leading those topics.

ALAN GREENBERG: That gives me a warm feeling.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. So that includes, basically, a background to these topics, what the current work is on those topics, etc. So, in order to make sure that the end user perspective is there, I have been asking that these sections also include a little bit of, a very small part, of time to allow the ACs and SOs support staff to say what the aim of the groups that they support will be for that.

So that's why I'm asking that.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the session that I'm participating in, the auction front, it's relatively easy because we will barely, by the time we get to Helsinki, have a draft charter. We probably will not be able to get it out in the 15 day delay that we're supposed to, for getting these things out. You mean that rules still apply for these meetings. So this is going to be the first time that people have a chance to see it, and there may well be things to discuss and input into the process.

For the ones, which are sort of in the middle of deliberations, a middle of discarding, I'm not quite sure. I can understand they'll be tutorials, the opportunity for feedback, I'm not quite sure how they're going to work, but I'm willing to go through it and hope that indeed, there is something there.

Tijani, go ahead, if that's a new hand.

Maybe it's not a new hand. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I have two questions. The first one is which one of the sessions would you be chairing in the afternoon?

ALAN GREENBERG: Option funds.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good luck, okay. All right, that's fine...

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I'm not chairing it, I'm vice-chairing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so then the other question is, is there...? As far as I understand, there is no public forum per se, is there?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, there is not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, I don't know whether right now is the right time to bring this up, or bring this up in any other business, but in today's outreach and

engagement call, the question of why this has now been renamed the policy forum when it was initially called an outreach meeting, was brought up, well I brought it up.

And the response that we had from Janet was that maybe this was the sort of thing we should be asking in the public forum. But there is no public forum. So she had said, perhaps you should be, or someone in At-Large should be asking the Board Chair in finding out when that can be discussed. Or, is this something that could be discussed in the last session of the last day? The meeting B wrap-up and planning ahead for ICANN 57. Is that also going to be a public forum with people being able to speak in the discussion?

Or is this just going to be, yada, yada, yada?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will not pretend to know what the format will be, but to the extent that there is an opportunity to bring it up at anything resembling a public forum, that last session on Thursday is it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. So thanks. It's Olivier speaking. So we're going to work it out with Dev, because I'm not quite sure who, what the hierarchy and how this is supposed to reach the Board Chair ears. And I don't know whether there has been a call for topics, as there usually is, for SO and AC chairs, or whether the [CROSSTALK] follow-up afterwards.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can predict the Board Chair will say, “These agendas and meeting planning is being planned by the community.” He has no say in it. So I don’t think the Board Chair is where the focus should be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well the problem though, and it’s Olivier speaking again. Sorry for continuing with this. The problem is that the community planned an outreach forum. The change of name to a policy forum was actually not done by the community, or was maybe asked by a certain segment of the community, but that certainly was not what the working group on meeting strategy had come up with.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I won’t repeat what I had said on that meeting, most of you have heard it. I think there is a significant staff led component here, that I think we need to talk about is going to be, to talk about that. But your comment is noted, and I think we all have an obligation, if you feel there is a problem to raise it.

We’re not going to change this particular meeting, but you are correct, if you look at the calendar of all future meetings, all B meetings are now classed as policy forums.

Anything else on the...? Sorry. Okay, anything else on the key topics for discussion or the specific forum? Tijani, you have your hand up.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I have a problem with the understanding of the meeting B. The meeting B was designed from the first, from the beginning, as, how to say, a policy, if you want, but not exactly [inaudible], but it is a discussion amongst our community, not cross community but inside our community discussion of our issues. It is done work for each community. And we have one day or half a day, for outreach.

It is not designed as an outreach meeting at all. We added the outreach because we said that those regions, when we will go, since we'll never go there, needs to have outreach, so we added this outreach. So the design of the meeting B was for internal work for the community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you, I agree Tijani. Well, it was a significant amount of time allocated for groups to work within their own walls, and a significant amount of time allocated for cross constituency, cross discussions intra meetings as opposed to inter. Somewhere along the way, a rule was made saying this was only policy.

And it has resulted in some rather curious anomalies for instance, the group that is overseeing the IANA transition wanted to schedule a meeting to inform the community of how the transition is going. And

they were told, “Sorry, that’s not policy.” And only an AC and a SO can talk about policy, therefore you can’t schedule a meeting.

Now, we found a way around it. But for them to be told that, I think just shows... I won’t continue. Somebody has a hand up and I don’t know who it is, it’s a S. It maybe Sebastien?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Alan, I’m sorry, it’s Sandra.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, Sandra! Sandra may I suggest you add some extra letters to your name?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yeah, I don’t know how to do this once logged in. So I did a mistake when registering...

ALAN GREENBERG: Just look to the right of attendees, the word attendees has a pull down that says edit your information. But please, now that you have the microphone, you can speak.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, thank you very much Alan. It’s Sandra speaking. Yeah, I’m pretty quiet most of the time, but when it comes to the structure of the meeting, I would like to add my takeaways from the meeting strategy

working group. In some points, Tijani, we have the same understanding that it was really a meeting to get the work done. This was the work we were using during our work, because I would like to remind us all, the big questions at the beginning was either to have two meetings in the future, or if you stick to the three meetings.

And because there were too many groups, which said no, we need some time to meet. We need some time to get some policy work done, and therefore the slightly smaller B meeting was invented. And this directly feed into it, not an issue which was identified by ICANN staff, by the meeting team, when they said, well for the B meetings, we have not many locations around the world, because ICANN meetings are getting bigger and bigger.

And then it was the point when they said, okay, having a smaller meeting here, we should really use that opportunity to reach out and to do some, to meet the local community in remote areas. Of course, in Helsinki, we're not in a very remote area, but we all know why we are in Helsinki now and not in Panama.

I believe that this meeting is not a very good example for B meeting, how it was designed, or how it was proposed by the meeting strategy working group. Still, I think, we can learn from this meeting, what went wrong, and where we can learn. I have the feeling, the whole ICANN community is somehow still sticking to their old procedures, how to run a meeting in terms of setting the agenda and so on and so forth.

And we can see this in our community, how many discussions we are having about the schedule, and how to arrange it, and actually how

what to do and what to get the best out of the meeting and so on and so forth. So I would call upon us not to struggle with it, just to take it as it is, take it as a pilot, learn from there, and the whole community will adjust later on.

And I truly believe that the work of the meeting strategy working group is not finished yet, we will continue after this first B and the next C meeting, so basically after one year of having the new structure. And the community will get used to them, so the rules or the new structures, which were proposed by the group. And here I also, somehow understand the meeting stuff around Nick [Tomaso] that they are, on some points, a little bit too strict in terms of allowing smaller groups to meet on a Friday or so on.

So I really think the way we are doing it now, in terms of arranging our own meetings in a bilateral, not bilateral, but in a small meeting room is absolutely the right way of doing it, and I believe other groups will find their own ways as well, and the...

I mean, if structure, how the meeting strategy working group proposed it will fly, this will take a couple of meetings, and maybe even have to adjust because we find out it's not working. The worst thing I would say is that we just go back to zero, and do it like we did it in the past, I'll say six years since I'm on the ICANN or on the ALAC.

I think this would be the worst case because the scope of this group was really to meet the needs for all groups because there are some groups which say we cannot afford to send our people three times a year. It is too much, time consuming, and so on and so forth. And we really have

to put some effort in it, and I'm very delighted that the ALAC is putting this effort to make the B meeting working and catching up the proposals which have been made by the meeting strategy working group. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Sandra. To be clear, I don't think any of the discussion we're having right now is disagreeing with the plans for the meeting strategy. Some people did not like it, but that's, I think we're beyond that right now. I think all we're talking about is not what came out of the meeting strategy, but how some of it is being implemented by staff.

You know, to be told that you can do internal work but it has to be policy, but it's not really legitimate, I think misunderstands what we do in a lot of the hours that we have. So I don't think it's the meeting strategy that there is objections to right now. I think the implementation, largely by staff. And again, on the Friday meeting, all we ask for is what we're getting, but the answer came back formally, we have to say no, but maybe your own staff can arrange it privately.

And again, that's, you know, that's saying, if we don't know about it, it's okay, but we can't officially bless it. And that again, is internal process, not what the meeting strategy group talked about. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you very much. It really has been an interesting discussion. I've just been Skyping with [inaudible] and let her know some of the lack of knowledge of how these class B sessions are going to run, both from

your part as well as staff's part. So he is going to be discussing this in an internal meeting planning call tomorrow. Gisella and I will be on that.

And I suggested that what might be useful is that there be a call with all of the AC SO SG chairs on what these B sessions are to number one, the content and secondly the format. So Alan, I'm not sure if you would support that, and if you do, I will continue passing that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have no problem that. I personally may have a problem with attending that meeting, depending on scheduling, but not problem. Sandra, is that a new hand?

No, it is not a new hand. All right, next item on the agenda, if no one wants to continue on this discussion, is on the ALT meetings. Well, it was meetings when I wrote it, now it's meeting, we have allocated and asked for a significant number of hours on the Friday. It is not clear that we will have the opportunity to have our normal visits with the Chair and with David Olive.

That's not ruled out at this point, but it's not a given. I would like, again, this group to take some step up and start working on an agenda for that meeting. The Friday morning meetings, because in the last couple of meetings, last several meetings anyway, have tended to be, once we cut off the time for David and Steve to talk, we haven't had a lot of time left, because these being abbreviated meetings for several meetings now.

This time we may well have a significant amount of time. We have made the claim that these meetings are both a combination of a post mortem and planning for the coming months, before people go away on vacation or whatever, and then suddenly things start up again three weeks later and we have not done any real planning.

So I would like to put, allocate a significant amount of that Friday morning session into some real planning and layout what we have to do, do assignments so we can get some real work done. So I would, and again, like the scheduling for the meeting itself, I would like other people to step up and start doing some of that.

I'll certainly participate in it. I'm not going to ask for assignments at this point, but I will send out a message to the ALT list, and I think we need some input to decide how to structure it. Do we want this, essentially just a free for all discussion? Or do we want some level of facilitation to walk us through things? But I'm looking for some input on that, so that when we come up with that meeting having been finished, we believe we've really accomplished something, and we can make the claim that we want to do it again because it was useful, as opposed to just a long breakfast.

So if anyone has any thoughts on it, I'll accept input now, but other than that, I'll just be sending out some mail in the next couple of days.

Hearing nothing, the last thing, which is again in a similar vein, we will likely have, I'm guessing, Heidi you can perhaps confirm, about half an hour or so with the CEO. And he will no doubt come in with a few things to say, but again, I think I'd like to start putting something

together as to what are the topics, we want to cover with him, give him an opportunity to think about things ahead of time.

So again, not something we have to do at this meeting, but going into Helsinki, and with some headway ahead of the time, I think we want to, we want to understand what we want out of the meeting. Comments or thoughts? None?

Heidi you asked in the chat, “If I’m not available and Tijani would also not likely be available at the same time...” Although, Tijani leaves later than I do, so he might be available. Could León be on the call? Someone should be on the call, and I’ll leave it up to you to find a leadership team, and preferably a vice-chair to do it, if I can’t.

Last item was Heidi’s item. Do we want a pre-meeting webinar aimed at At-Large as opposed to the ICANN wide ones? Heidi, do you want to present why you think we need one?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, just a thought that if it is going to be, if the questions of these discussions will be primarily, you know, PDP and GNSO based, then before At-Large arrives or participates, it might be very useful for them to, for you to lead a session on what these sessions are, to explain that, to perhaps discuss to know what possible impact it might have on end users, and that ALAC used on the... Thank you.

And secondly, and just a minor point, is that this is supposed to be a policy discussion forum, and it might be useful to just inform At-Large what is going to be discussed.

ALAN GREENBERG: You are talking about aiming this at At-Large or ALAC and regional leaders? In other words, aiming it at people who will be at the meeting, or wider?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well I hope both. I mean, I would hope that the ALAC and the regional leaders would be there, and also the leadership members themselves, and would be participating in that way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Comments people?

Olivier has a comment. Before Olivier speaks, I wouldn't mind seeing some statistics about when we hold these meetings, who actually shows up. That might be interesting before we schedule another one. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Support from me on this. There are several big room discussions taking place every day in the afternoon, and it would be interesting for us to be able to coordinate our thoughts on this, or discuss our thoughts on this prior to attending those meetings.

You know, what's our view on the ICANN accountability and CCWG? Okay, that we would probably know, but what's our view on the PDP

Next Generation registration directory services? That's a view in the community of the charter of the CCWG on the new gTLD auction proceeds, etc. etc.

And that would be just focusing on these afternoon sessions and getting a big, a quick discussion within At-Large on these might be of help.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. If we're looking at a 90 minute session, that's about 10 minutes a piece. Just to frame how much time we would have. Okay, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, Holly Raiche for the transcript record. Look, Heidi, I think it's a good idea, I'm just not sure if there is actually time for getting together all of the regional stuff to do a webinar. I think that having, I know APRALO's view, we actually do one webinar a month on various topics, and it's very useful.

If we can actually start doing that ALAC wide, that would be very useful. It may be too early to do that for this meeting, but maybe just put that on the agenda, and possibly have a webinar afterwards to say what happens, and then in the future, plan for webinars more in advance for this one. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone else?

I've heard a couple of comments saying it's probably a good thing, I haven't heard anyone saying anything negative, other than my asking how many people actually attend these. Sometimes I think the ones who need it most are the ones who don't attend. Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Hi Alan. Maureen for the record. I mean, I agree. I think it's important that we have, you know, we can actually sort of like explain like what's on top of the, the policies that are on top of most, that are going to be focused on at the meeting. It's just that I think sometimes, you know, they can be quite technical at times and people, you know, some of the...

I mean, I know that the newbies, and of course we're encouraging newbies to sort of like check into the webinars, if at all possible, to try to better understand what's going on. But they get a bit swamped with the technical side of things, and the use of, you know, acronyms and that you know, so because they had a lot of explanations that are given in some of the webinars.

You know, I guess it's just, we've got to look at the approach that we use in this. You know, in these [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess I agree with you, but I'm interested in your last comment of, we need to look at the approach. I'm not quite sure how you cover a technical subject like RDS, or for that matter, the multi-faceted subject of the next round of gTLDs, do it in eight minutes, and not overwhelm

people with terms they're unfamiliar with. I find those two in conflict with each other, and you know, to say, by the time you finish this eight minutes, you're going to be well-prepared to have the discussion, but we won't confuse you, I'm not sure I know how to do that.

But we can certainly give it a try. We're going to need volunteers to take the, carry the banner for some of these sessions. I'm willing to certainly give it a try, and let's see how many people show up. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hopefully you can hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can. You're marvelous now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hey. Well, I'm now on a phone line as opposed to the AC room that I was trying to use. I hear what Maureen is saying. First of all, let me start, I [inaudible] webinars and also the small briefings that Olivier was referring to is a useful and good way forward, and we may as well at least paying, with the onsite topic briefings, at the B meeting. [Inaudible] anyway, and it makes sense for it to be leading with a policy meeting, if you're looking at meetings that are dealing with [inaudible] as such, well you can't expect the fact that the ALAC people should know what they're bloody well saying and doing, and shouldn't have to 101 them.

But I do think the topics for a brief 101 as well. Maureen, I certainly see what you're saying, and I, for example, the last one we did in APRALO on DNS security, something that I am admittedly fairly familiar with, I thought unless you were familiar with, you would have glazed over and probably started checking your emails and doing your banking.

It's no criticism that the core competency of the presenters, it's a criticism of what we've asked them to do and how we've asked them to do it. And we probably, Alan, need to give some clear mandates or guidance to presenters. Not all presenters are made equal. And I would suggest that there are times when simply taking the additional amount of time to stay facing in full language, and then use the acronym, makes a big difference.

So part of it is a bit of in service training such as [inaudible] guidelines as presented, and one of the things I thought we found with the use of the pop quizzes for example, if we need to be very careful that the pop quizzes are set up to fulfill a purpose, and not be confusing. For example, the ones in the APRALO security call, you had five choices. None of the choices were all of the above, and in most of the cases, the choices were three out of the five were correct.

Well, people spend so much time going, is this one right or is this one wrong? That has less choice and all of the above, would have done it far more effectively. I mean, that was just education guidelines and training that we could put in. So I think we could do better. We've got to find the time to do this, however.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. I'm going to call an end to this discussion. I think we have a general consensus. We want a pre-meeting webinar focusing on the types of subjects that would be covered in the afternoon session, and ask Heidi to try to organize it to make that happen. We are now 30 minutes behind schedule, and...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've got to go too.

ALAN GREENBERG: And therefore we have something like 18 minutes to cover an hour's worth of topics. It was a good discussion. Next item is At-Large review status. The working party has met with the independent reviewer. I think I can say with some confidence, that most of us have a moderately good feeling, a warm feeling, that this will not be a useless exercise, and we will not be subject to someone who really doesn't understand and doesn't care to understand us.

And I'm not quite sure there is a lot more to say at this point, but Holly or Cheryl, there were five minutes allocated to this, I will give it to you if you need it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nope.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone want to?

No? Next item, fiscal year 17 requests. The results are out. If you haven't looked at it, you should. They make very interesting reading, not specifically the At-Large ones, but if you look at the overall community ones, we got a fair number of the ones that we thought we were going to get.

We didn't get the ones we thought we were going to get, but in many cases, we had some at least modest level of commitment that GSE would be looking kindly on some of those. The only one that was as expected, but we are now going to have to deal with how to handle it, is well again, as expected, the three GAs that were requested, we were told that we will fund, ICANN will fund two of them, and it's up to us to decide how to do that.

The consensus we came to in an ALT meeting a month or so ago is, when we did have this discussion, was that the North American one, which was already tentatively funded, but they, when there was one funded for Europe or North America, and North America gave the Dublin meeting to Europe, that we would then fund the North American one soon. We of course, do not have a meeting in North America this year.

So we are now talking about the possibility of a North American GA being held at an ARIN meeting, that is not a given at this point. We have to get ARIN to agree, and they have not necessarily agreed to this when it has been raised in the past, but that's in progress. If North America can do a meeting at ARIN, and because of the issues in LACRALO, we will probably have to take the GA funds and use it towards an assembly that is aimed at essentially reconciliation within the RALO, that leaves

AFRALO without the funds in this fiscal year. But as we previously discussed, there will be a meeting in Abu Dhabi, which is close enough, although it's not in region. It meets the airfare characteristics of a regional GA, and there is also the potential for using Johannesburg, which although it is technically not in the right fiscal year, it's close enough that we might convince the finance people if that turns out to be a better choice than Abu Dhabi.

If it were Abu Dhabi, there is a good chance that we would have an AP and AF GA at the same time. That of course presumes that we don't move the meeting from Abu Dhabi to Lord knows where. Tijani and then Cheryl.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. If you remember well, last year when we applied for a General Assembly, they said we cannot hold at the same time, the high level meeting of the GAC and a General Assembly of the AFRALO. That's why they said, we will fund it next year. So this year, I think that the best way to do it is in Johannesburg. Johannesburg is in the fiscal year of FY 17.

So I think that it is the best way to do it there, and we try to let the opportunity for APRALO to have their General Assembly perhaps in Abu Dhabi. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, there is no question about an AP this year, in this fiscal year, that's not in the cards. I'm just saying that if there were an AFRALO in Abu

Dhabi, there might an AP at the same time. But AP is not in the cards this year. So last time we had this discussion, you agreed that either Abu Dhabi or perhaps, if it was agreeable to the finance people, Johannesburg would be an acceptable alternative for the GA for AFRALO.

You're now saying you do not agree anymore?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No, I don't say that. I don't say that. I say that the preference is for Johannesburg. It is not possible, of course we'll do it in Abu Dhabi.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. I misunderstood. Assuming we go ahead with North America this year, remember, North America at ARIN is not a guaranteed option, so we might not have two General Assemblies that we can hold this year, if all we're looking at is LACRALO and NARALO. So first we have to settle that.

If we settle that, then I agree, Johannesburg is the optimal case, but that would have to be on funds allocated for fiscal year 18, and with permission to use them a month early. Now since they don't pay the bills until July for a June meeting, they shouldn't have a problem with that.

But just like I don't predict elections, I don't predict what finance people say. Okay, so I think we're in general agreement that we have a plan going forward, is contingent on a number of issues, including how ARIN

responds, that we should know in some number of days, I'm hoping. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks Alan. I was just going to say very much what some of what you just said, but why I put my hand up is I thought there should be a strong argument for the North American meeting going on in ARIN, because of the exceptional circumstances of all of these chess playing that's been going on with the location of the meetings. And to that end, I also thought that the argument should be quite strong for the choice of Johannesburg, which is obviously Tijani's preference.

It would not fit well, I believe, for us to in Abu Dhabi, be proposing to share. APRALO has not had a General Assembly in a non-summit ATLAS format since the Beijing meeting. I don't think you would have a very happy APRALO people, if we get bumped in our next natural turn. We aren't having them, obviously, when we're not in the calendar, and then the meetings end up in our region.

So it's not that we're not having the meetings in our region, but you know, we're often doing showcases, etc. etc., but we're not doing General Assemblies, and that, of course, is where the actual work gets done. The others are just titillating and fun, good PR, but not actual work. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just to be clear, the question of whether we hold the meeting, the North American meeting at ARIN is not an issue whether

ICANN will allow a GA to be held somewhere else, the question is whether ARIN is interested in having it.

In the past, they have been somewhat reluctant to do things jointly. We'll leave it at that for the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood Alan, but wasn't some of that, before you had [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not quite. Sensitive discussions, let's leave it at that [CROSSTALK] not for an open meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought [inaudible] some of that, but obviously I need to talk to my people again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, is that a new hand?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: A new hand, yes. Thank you Alan. The Johannesburg meeting is from 26th to 29th June 2017. So it is in the framework of FY 17. [Inaudible] why Abu Dhabi is from 28th of October to 3 of November, 2017, and it is FY 18.

So for FY 17, Johannesburg is decided, Abu Dhabi is not. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Tijani, but we only have funding for two General Assemblies in fiscal year 17, officially.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly, yes, and that's why I am saying that for FY 17, AFRALO may have its General Assembly in Johannesburg...

ALAN GREENBERG: And who are you suggesting we give the other one to?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Why I am saying that for AFRALO is because I am selfish, it is because last year, and the decision of the budget, they said that this is postponed to FY 17. Euro General Assembly will be held in FY 17, and will be funded in FY 17. And that's why we planned for Johannesburg for a very long time, from last year.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, I understand, but this is the ALAC leadership team, and we're trying to figure out how we accommodate all five RALOs, and if we say that you have one in the middle of fiscal year 17, that means we only have the funds for one other one, which means either North America, which gave up their one to Europe doesn't get one, or we do not have the reconciliation meeting for LACRALO.

And that's the quandary we're in right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, the recent selection is really important. You know, we've got a couple of exceptional balls being juggled at once here, and it has not been helped by the chess game of where to have meetings.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, may I tell you, in my point of view, since there is not a meeting in North America in FY 17, we may give the General Assembly of North America for FY 18, because there is not a General Assembly in the region for this period. If LACRALO reconciliation meeting is very important, and I agree, I fully agree with that, I think this is, in my point of view, because we have three RALOs, and we have three General Assemblies, we have meetings in one region, which is Johannesburg, AFRALO, and we have a very important meeting of LACRALO.

Can we postpone the meeting of NARALO? It's not because I am from Africa, I am trying to, as you said, as an ALT member, to think about it.

ALAN GREENBERG: The reason that we discussed it last time and came to the conclusion that Abu Dhabi was acceptable, is because although it's not in your region, it is within the flight path of your region, whereas a meeting in, Bangalore, for example, is not within the flat path of North America. So it's just, it's a happenstance that it may well allow us to satisfy it, plus

we have the option of perhaps getting Johannesburg, but funding it out of fiscal year 18 budget.

We're not going to be able to get that question answered before we finish the fiscal year 17, setting up the budget. So we're going to have to leave that a little bit up in the air. So I think, at this point, we're looking for flexibility. We may find out we don't have an option for North American GA this coming fiscal year, at which point, we have easy answers to it, not easy for North America, but easy period.

But I think we're going to have to keep our options open right now, and be flexible, knowing that we have the five year window that we want to have GAs in, and assuming the Board agrees that we want budget flexibility, they will probably agree to have budget flexibility over a three day period, which is what we're talking about for a fiscal year 18 funded GA in Johannesburg.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, do you know how long AFRALO didn't have a General Assembly? It was, the last one was in Dakar.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand completely. I have looked at that chart far more than I can possibly imagine, when I was doing...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hang on, the last time we all had General Assemblies was in London. Let's not forget our summit.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I know, this is for everyone, Cheryl. I am talking about...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...Tijani, that AP and AF are in almost identical situations, which is why I think trying to get the General meetings happening, even though it gets argued that it gets paid out of the FY 18 budget, is a good way forward. And I can see you have an exceptional argument, to get that to happen, and I think that's the way it should happen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And Cheryl, I support fully that the APRALO has a General Assembly as well. [CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...I'm interested in AFRALO in Johannesburg, and I think we need to argue for that. Later on, I will argue for APRALO in Abu Dhabi, but that's not our current discussion.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. So we are in agreement.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Tijani, if I understand properly, you are agreeing for a Johannesburg meeting funded out of fiscal year 17 budget, I believe Cheryl is arguing for a Johannesburg meeting from the other fiscal year 18 budget.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's what I'm arguing, correct.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you mean that ICANN will pay from the fiscal year 18 money before the fiscal year budget is adopted? I don't understand [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: The bills normally get paid 30 days after a meeting.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Okay, so Cheryl let us discuss it perhaps offline, because we are spending a lot of time now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed. All right. The next item is the review of the ALAC agenda. There were no action items that need to be attended to by this group, so we can skip over that one. Elections, selections, and appointments, we have all of the recommendations for the NomCom delegates at this point.

I think there was a LACRALO poll which they decided to hold, at the very last moment, I believe that that poll has ended already. Is that correct?
Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel for the record. I don't believe we have a poll for that NomCom delegate submission [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: It wasn't a poll, it was a mailing list call for agreement, and I don't believe I have seen anyone say no. It was a 48 hour call. Okay, let's presume at this point, we have a recommendation on all of the, on all of the people. There is, the ALAC call agreed that we would do a formal vote, and that will be starting shortly on the NomCom delegates, and the vote will be a single vote on all five of the delegates who are identified.

In terms of elections, I was reelected to the NARALO seat in North America.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Congratulations.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Or condolences, depending on how you look at it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...enough to say, Alan, come on.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Alberto Soto is the incoming ALAC rep from Latin America Caribbean. And do we have any...? Europe will not be settled for

another three and a half hours. So we'll have the result of that one. We have secretariat votes in several of the regions that are now settled. In North America, there were no changes.

AFRALO, the Chair stays as Aziz. And the secretariat is Sarah [Kitter]. Did I miss any selections that are ongoing?

Staff? Heidi?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. You've got it all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani, is that a new hand?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right. As far as I know, that's it. Next item is selection committee. You will recall a while ago, we talked about creation of a selection committee in conjunction with the GAC liaison. I put that on hold for a number of reasons that I'll talk about privately, if you wish. But I think we have to act, at this point, very quickly.

The suggestion for a selection committee was... Olivier, are you still with us?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND I am always with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The last selection committee that you ran, there were several of them, I think. You ran it as chair, and there were two people that were elected by each region. Am I correct?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I believe so, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And were you there as sort of an impartial chair or representing your region?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND It's Olivier speaking. I think that the way that it was happening was there was each time, an ALAC member, and someone selected by the RALO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That matches what I'm going to propose. [CROSSTALK] ...not representing Europe.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not representing Europe. It's a document, there is a Wiki page.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm sure there is, but I haven't had the time to find it, I'm afraid. Okay, I am going to suggest to the ALAC that we put together a selection committee, composed similarly to what you suggested, that is one ALAC member, and my preference would be the ALT, because there are people who are heavily involved, but there is no requirement that it be an ALT member, selected from among the ALAC members.

One person selected per region, selected by the RALO according to their own processes, with an extra proviso with what Cheryl suggested. That is, four selections such as people on review committees, that this is the group that makes the decision, for the more, for the less usual situation of ALAC, formal appointments to things like, as liaisons to other groups, I am suggesting that although the [inaudible] 10 person group will participate, should it come down to a vote, that it be the ALAC members, since we are in a position where these people then are going to have to represent the ALAC.

And I believe the ALAC members have to take precedence. And that is, I believe, what Cheryl suggested in our last discussion of this. How does that sound to people?

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. I think that perhaps have to let the group make the decision normally as a whole group, not differentiate between ALAC member and not, and the recommendation of this group, we go to the ALAC, and ALAC will approve or disapprove the decision. So it would be at the end, the decision of ALAC and another body.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you're arguing for the prior situation, not what I am suggesting. Anybody else?

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I had, I still maintain that whilst this group should function and indeed, make recommendations, that if it's an ALAC, representative of the ALAC, the ALAC, just as it does with NomCom appointees, must have the right of refusal and the ability to appoint itself, which is slightly modified, I think, on what you are saying Tijani. If for example, the ALAC did not want to appoint someone coming out of this committee to the representatives for the government advisory committee, for example, a formal liaison, that the ALAC felt that the person that this committee put forward, was not the best for whatever reason, that they would probably have to ask the committee to then reconvene and see if they could send back someone more suitable.

Where I think what they should do in the case of the ALAC appointing people to represent them, this has the ability to say, thank you for your input committee, but we actually are going to take this person, not the one you recommended. It doesn't sound very democratic, and it's not because formal liaisons make or break the position. And if we put incompetence or people who, for whatever reason, cannot perform, it affects the ALAC far more significantly than most other appointments.

In fact, you could probably carry some dead wood on the NomCom more than you can carry some dead wood on something like the sole liaison point to another AC or SO. That's just my highly biased view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? Tijani has already spoken so let's hear from someone else before I defer back to him. We are running over and we're not quite finished yet. I'm afraid that's life. Anybody else have any thoughts on this? Tijani is the only ALT member, other than me, former ALT member, that has expressed an opinion.

León, we don't know, is he actually on this call or not?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I am here.

ALAN GREENBERG: You are here. Do you have any thoughts?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: No, I think that the way that you proposed sounds reasonable to me. So you have my support in that.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is a thought, thank you. Anybody else would like to speak up? We have Sandra and Holly.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Holly has left.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly has left. We'll deal with Holly separately. Sandra has left also. Or at least she's not in Adobe Connect.

I'll take this to the list then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sandra has noted, I agree. I assume she's agreeing with you, Alan, on the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I will check with Holly and then I will send out a message. In terms of the GAC liaison, which has been now approved, we clearly do not have time to go through a formal process, and I would like to suggest to the ALAC, that they allow the ALT to do an interim appointment, so that we have someone in Helsinki who can be seating in those meetings and representing us.

I don't think we want to let the opportunity slip. Tijani, you still have your hand up. Yes, go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I propose to separate two things. The formal liaison should be appointed directly by ALAC, and all of the other appointments should go through the nominating committee, or through the selection committee. And in this case, we would not have any problem because

those people who are officially representing the At-Large on the other constituencies, will be selected directly by ALAC, and the others will be selected by the selection committee, like we did before.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is the selection committee's recommendations always went to the ALAC for ratification. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Did I put my hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm asking you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh. It's Olivier speaking. As someone who has been... Well, in the past, yes. If you look at the way that it was done, I think that the recommendations were made to the ALAC, and the ALAC had to give the final green light for it. Because any appointment that's made by the ALAC anyway.

So there was, if this... If the recommendation made by the working group or by the selection party was incompatible with what the ALAC thought would be the person, then the ALAC has a chance of selecting someone else, or it would ask the committee to come up with someone else.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani, for clarity, who are you suggesting does the triage of applications? Because that's what we're looking at. We're saying, taking the applications and trying to decide what the best person is to recommend to the ALAC. Who are you suggesting do that? Can't be the full 15 person ALAC, that's not practical.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The ALT can do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So you're suggesting the ALT. That's different then... I'm willing to make that proposal, because that maps essentially to what I was suggesting. But I was suggesting the other five people sit in deliberations, but they don't necessarily have a vote. You're simply saying, they're not even in the room.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You are speaking about triage, I am speaking about selection. It is different. Means that if we have 10 people applying, and the ALT will say doesn't have the requirements, because we have to put requirements for each appointment. Who doesn't meet the requirements? This is the role of the ALT, and then all people who meet the requirement, will go through the selection of ALAC or a selection committee. This is the way I see it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. I now understand the difference, and I'll present it. I'll send a draft to the ALT before I send it out to the group, to make sure I haven't misunderstood something. Any other business? Just my travel plans, I will be at the African Internet Summit leaving home late on the 1st of June, arriving back on the 12th.

I should have internet connectivity, except for the 20 odd ahrs in the air in between. But of course, it is a meeting, and my time will not be fully my own. That's number one. And number two, I am taking about 12 days, or 13 days, after the ICANN meeting, and I'll be staying in Finland. I should have internet connectivity a lot of the time, but I don't plan to spend an awful lot of time on ICANN events, on ICANN affairs.

I will be talking to people individually to try and replace me on various aspects of the job. But just so you know, I will be in transit or gone for a fair amount of that time. Anything else before we adjourn? I'm sorry we have run over, that seems to be becoming a standard in our meetings, and I'm not quite sure why things have changed, but we'll see what we can do better in the future. Yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

This is Heidi. On the topic of travel, I wanted to let everyone know that I will be in Washington, D.C. for a team leader's meeting, basically, including travel, from the 30th of May through the 2nd of June. And then the following week, the AC SO support team are, so that would be Gisella, Terri, and Yeşim, Nathalie, etc., will be in Istanbul. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you send out emails so we have all of the dates in front of us? You can include my dates in that as well if you wish.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perfect. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Thank you all for attending this rather long, laborious meeting. I wish you all [CROSSTALK]...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...15 minutes is not a matter of the end of the world.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not apologizing for the over, I'm apologizing for the whole meeting. From my point of view, it has been exhausting. I don't know about the rest of you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, can I just say, out of the probably 40 hours of calls that Olivier and I have been in this week, if not more, this one is not one of those of finishing up and going, well there is 60 or 90 minutes of my life I'm never going to get back.

ALAN GREENBERG: We couldn't have replaced this one with poetry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We could have not have done that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. For those who didn't understand what I just said, don't worry about it. Thank you all. If it's evening time, enjoy the evening. If it's morning, enjoy the morning, and anything in between.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]