

YESIM NAZLAR:

Welcome to today's ALAC Monthly Call taking place on Tuesday, 24 May 2016, at 12:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Garth Bruen, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Sebastien Bachollet, Vanda Scartezini, Seun Ojedeji, Ron Sherwood, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Siranush Vardanyan, Janvier Ngnoulaye, Isaac Maposa, Ali AlMeshal, and Candice Mendez.

On the Spanish channel, we have Maritza Agüero and Alberto Soto. On the French channel, we have Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. We don't have anyone on the Russian channel.

We have apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Kaili Kan, Julie Hammer, Sandra Hoferichter, Leah Symekher, and Bastiaan Goslings.

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

Our French interpreters today are Claire and Isabelle. Our Spanish interpreters are Veronica and Claudia. And our Russian interpreters are Galina and Yulia.

Finally, I would like to remind everyone to state their while speaking, not only for the transcript purposes, but also for interpretation purposes as well.

Over to you, Alan. 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.*

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have a packed agenda, and we're starting rather late today. But hopefully, we'll get through it without running too much overtime. We do have a session at the end which might be in camera, which would be restricted to the ALAC members and the formal liaisons to other ICANN bodies.

The first item is any action items that are outstanding that require the involvement to the ALAC. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, there are none. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perfect. Five minutes back. Thank you.

Policy development activities. Do we have Ariel on the line? We do.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. We have the statements that are in progress. There's one that is drafted by Holly and Carlton. It's in response to the Request for Input – The Next Generation RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP. They just uploaded the first draft to the wiki workspace, and now it's a period for soliciting comments from the At-Large community.

Another one that's in progress is with regards to At-Large Request for Input - New gTLD Subsequent Procedures. In fact, I need to put a preliminary list of the ALAC policy advice statements related to gTLDs in

---

consultation with Alan, Cheryl, and Olivier. I plan to finish this task by the end of this week, and then we will [inaudible] to the list some time later this week.

These are the two in progress.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, the gTLD one you have is a closing date a week ago, is that correct?

ARIEL LIANG: No. The gTLD closing date is June 17.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, you have May 17. Or at least at the time I printed out the agenda, it was May 17.

ARIEL LIANG: Oh, I'm sorry. I probably put the wrong date there.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay.

ARIEL LIANG: June 17.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Okay, sorry to interrupt.

ARIEL LIANG:                        Then there's one public comment that's new, and I think, Alan, you are going to talk about that in a later part of the agenda. It's regarding the Revisions to ICANN Expected Standards of Behaviors.

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Yes, that is on the agenda later.

ARIEL LIANG:                        That's all from me.

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Any comments from anyone else? Nothing? Then again, we've gained a bit of time.

The review of any ALS Applications or process.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                      Hi, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Go ahead, Heidi.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: We have some changes here. We currently have 193 At-Large Structures. That is down a little bit because of several who are decertified from NARALO. There's a list on the agenda of those decertified. We also have a new ALS, which is WZRI in EURALO in Vienna. Then there are currently several applications pending, including for regional advice. Those are in EURALO, LACRALO, and AFRALO. I'm sorry. That's regional advice that has been received. The regional advice waiting is in LACRALO for one At-Large Structure. There are several that staff are currently processing due diligence for. That is it, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Any comments on ALSes? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we will go on to reports.

Reports. We normally don't have extensive reports from any entities, working groups, RALOs, liaisons, but if anyone would like to highlight anything or where we are, I would welcome any input. Julie I see is not on. Maureen, you are the only one actually because Olivier is not on either and he gave me nothing to present. Go ahead, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I'd j like to highlight that in Helsinki we usually have and in our face-to-face meetings we usually try to organize a meeting with ccNSO and the ALAC, a joint meeting. For the next meeting because everything is quite condensed, the ccNSO has invited us to attend two sessions that have become cross-community sessions. One is with the GAC to discuss a survey that they did on PDP issues, and the other one also includes the GAC and the GNSO to talk about [inaudible]

---

procedure. So I thought it would be – I know that there are some conflicts with ALAC meetings, but I think it would be helpful if we could [get] at least some members of the ALAC to those meetings. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Maureen. If you could remind us when we get to the Helsinki meeting scheduling to point out or ask Gisella to point out where those sessions are, and we'll see what we can do with that.

Anything else on reports? We are making outstanding time. We're actually slightly ahead of time at this point. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry that I am late, but I just think that we have – first of all, you can hear me correctly?

ALAN GREENBERG: Very well.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you. I have a question about what is written on the new [inaudible] because I have the impression that a mail was sent just yesterday to inform OGC that they are a certified ALS, and at that same time we are requested to vote on the same organization. I have the impression that there is a mismatch between OCG and WZRI. I hope that staff can confirm that there are no mistakes. If not, to make the change. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, are you in a position to question out, or do you want to take it as an AI?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. Action item, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Please, if it can be so noted. Anything else? That was going back to Agenda Item 4 on ALS Applications. One final call for anything on ALS Applications or Reports. Hearing nothing, we will go on to Item 7 on Accountability Next Steps.

Leon is not on the call. I can report that I did submit the comments that I had made with a further comment saying that it had consensus approval of the ALAC. There was only one person who identified one of the two parts that they did not agree with. Of course, that has now gone into the Mixmaster that will come out with the final Bylaws.

It's not clear yet to me whether we will see those Bylaws in time to make any last comments prior to them going to the Board for approval. Cheryl, do you know anything about that? There has been some discussion on the list with a number of people saying they believe we should see something, but I haven't actually seen a confirmation. Do you know anything about that process?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As far as I am aware, we will be seeing a redline version yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: For some brief period of time?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. That is excellent. Thank you. I have nothing else to report on the Accountability. Clearly in my mind, most people are taking a breather right now and trying to catch up on the rest of their lives before the zoo starts again. But at this point, I'm sure the lawyers and other people involved in drafting are starting to ramp up rather furiously, given that the comment period closed on Saturday. But us mortals, at this point, are relaxing a little bit on it. Final comments? A smiley face from Cheryl. I'm not sure if that means she's one of the mere mortals who is relaxing or not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Relaxing? What is this you speak of?

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. In that case, we're racing along and we have an item on At-Large Working Groups. My name is on it, but in fact that's some work that Maureen has done. I would like if Maureen can, please, give us a brief idea of where we are and what she believes our next steps are. I



---

didn't think we had enough time to discuss it in this meeting. If I had realized how fast things were going, I might have put it on as a more substantive item. But, Maureen, do you have any quick comments?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. No, I wasn't prepared for this, but I'll [inaudible]. There were about ten working groups that we looked at. Of course, I think there were [six] that we initially looked at and decided that they should become [actors], except that some of them are not currently [actors]. They're on hold as such. So there is a decision that has to be made about whether we actually have – how do we identify these groups that aren't actually regularly meeting and currently on hold. So that's a decision that we're still discussing. But there are four – I think there were four – two of the working groups are currently not operating and two are probably actually becoming a little bit more obvious now. So they could come out of their dormant stage. So there's still a lot of work to be looked at. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Another thing I noted is we have been talking in this small group – or perhaps in this group too I think at once – about to what extent charters and missions and things like that are required. As you know, I've been going over the Rules of Procedure to update them for, among other things, the At-Large director selection. One of the things I noted is the Rules of Procedure do, in fact, call for all working teams – which is the generic term we use for workgroups, subcommittees, whatever – must have terms of reference or a charter.

---

Now, of course, many of our working groups predate the Rules of Procedure, so I suspect what we should be doing, among other things, is as we go through the working groups verify that indeed these groups if they're going to continue to exist must meet our definition, have some sort of statement. It doesn't have to be a 12-page charter, but at least a mission statement, a terms of reference, or a full-blown charter, depending on what's applicable, should be associated with each working group if we're going to maintain it in some level of active status. So that's something I think we'll look at.

I think we should try to plan to, in Helsinki, review them one-by-one. I'll be talking to Maureen and anyone else who has been involved in this process or wants to be involved in the process, and we'll try to have a recommendation on the table before we get to Helsinki so people can look it over and do their homework.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. Just regarding the terms of reference, whilst many of them do predate the formality of that type of thing, most of them that were created in the Confluence wiki days – so anything that wasn't a social text construct in wiki – we have used for quite some time a system in the design for the wiki pages, which means that there is for most of them if not all of them an identifiable description or purpose. Could I recommend that rather than try and create [inaudible] than Ben Hur, which is a movie reference to an epic, that we try and focus on looking at the relevance of that when it exists, and where it doesn't

---

exist, making it relevant just to try and keep it relatively neat and tidy?  
It may be a less complicated task if we do it that way. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, we spent a lot of time on administration, and the issue about working groups was not meant to be a “make work” activity and certainly not a huge diversion from other things, just a matter of housekeeping and getting things in order. So, yes, if indeed a workgroup has something which we can deem to be a terms of reference, mission, or charter, then we need to find it and make sure it’s visible and findable. If not, decide we either need one or the workgroup shouldn’t be there. I don’t think this is a major activity. I hope it isn’t. It shouldn’t. I think we need to make sure it doesn’t become a major activity.

There was a bit of discussion on the mail that [inaudible] that maybe we should take this opportunity to write a full-fledged manual for how workgroups operate and things like that. I personally thought that was somewhat excessive and not something that was a priority on our agenda right now.

Any other issues on this item? We’re on Item 8, At-Large Working Groups, and we are making fantastic time. I suspect we may end early if we’re lucky enough. Or we may manage to extend the meeting to run late. It has happened before.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Don’t say it. It’ll be a jinx.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. The next item is Item 9, At-Large Review. For once, we have made significant progress at this point. The reviewers have been selected. There was an inaugural meeting of the At-Large working party yesterday, which I thought was quite productive. I also had a short one-on-one talk with the reviewers prior to that, and I came out of it with a very warm feeling that these people were not going to come in and make the standard recommendations that worked for their last three engagements.

In fact, this team I believe has never actually been together as a single team. Among their own tasks, they consider themselves each of them checking each other to make sure that we're not going to be given cookie-cutter recommendations that worked somewhere else. They seem to understand well that we are rather unique in a whole bunch of ways, and I think with some trepidation they are jumping in and hope to be able to help.

They have confirmed they're not here to completely redesign At-Large. I don't think any of us could sustain that. But I think they understand that we have some problems and we're looking to them for some guidance.

With that, I open the floor to Holly and to Cheryl who are the co-chairs of the working party. Cheryl had been in an ex officio role, and we have changed that to act as a co-chair because this is going to be a really heavy workload as we go forward in the next little while and relying on a single person tends to be somewhat putting heavy pressure on that one person. So we're trying to spread the work around and since Cheryl

---

had already agreed to serve on that committee, we thought that was reasonable.

I open the floor. I'd like impressions from anyone on the working party, not only necessarily Holly and Cheryl but impressions of the consultants there. They seem to be pretty candid, and I guess I'd like to hear if anyone has any concerns or any positive things to say. Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I talked with [Nick] [inaudible] one of those guys because we used to work together now for three years, and we exchanged a lot of information after they got the approval. He is a very positive personality, and he understands a lot about ICANN, about everything related to the governance and the distribution around the world of the issues.

What we worked together is [exactly] something similar to that, that is talking about an outreach to people around the world. So we are together every week, and I know he will add a lot of value to this group because of his experience in the field [inaudible] talking within not-for-profit organizations around the world and bringing them to understand what is Internet for them and blah, blah, blah. So I do believe that we are in good hands. That's just my first impression.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Vanda. Anyone else care to contribute? Holly? Cheryl? Sebastien, go ahead. Sebastien, then Holly.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It will not be substantial. It will be very short. Just to be transparent, as you may know or if not you will find out one day, that I used to be working for ITEMS International. My contract ended in March, not this year but the year before. I have not been involved in anything in the proposal made by them and I have no relationship anymore at the level of the work. Some of them are friends but nothing else. I wanted to be very transparent about that just to be sure that there is no [inaudible] on what is happening. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. Do you have any comments on the individuals as consultants?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think as you say the team was put together specifically for this task. I know that they were putting other teams for other tasks with different people. What is interesting in this team is they are spread around the world, maybe not everywhere but in at least different places and they will come with different points of view and that will be interesting. I am sure that they can do well because part of them, at least Tom Mackenzie, used to do a review for ccNSO and for ISO within ICANN. And the others know part of ICANN quite well or part of the region quite well, then it will be interesting to see.

I have the impression that it's a good team and they are not coming with an idea what to do, how to do it. They will really listen to us and take into account our input and what they will find out. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Sebastien. That's nice to hear from someone who has at least peripherally been involved in some of them. Their CVs are interesting, and I suggest that people read them. I'm presuming we'll find pointers to them sometime if not readily available today. They're not what you would always expect based on the origins of the people and, so to speak, the color of their skin and that kind of thing. They've lived in places and worked in places that you might not expect without actually knowing them personally. So I think it's going to be an interesting group. Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry, Holly. Very, very quickly, I just wanted to say that I got a really good feel about the team. Vanda and Sebastien said their backgrounds are extensive and their knowledge of ICANN is already there, so we won't be having to explain ourselves too greatly, and that they really seem to be listening to what we were saying in [each of our] contributions. They really listened to what we were saying, [and I think that's] very positive for us and At-Large. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Maureen. They have done two other reviews for ICANN before, very, very different reviews – the ASO and the ccNSO – and they understand that there's not a lot of relationship other than the word ICANN between the three of us, and that's good. I was a little worried when it was mentioned that they had done a number of other reviews because there are a number of reviews that have been done in the past

---

---

that I've been very critical of. There's were not among them, and that was a fair amount of relief on my part.

Holly or Cheryl, do you want to add anything, or do you feel everything has been said at this point?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly has something to say, and I did have my hand up but someone put it down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. I didn't know we had any of those phantom "hand-downers."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, Holly, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm just leaving it to Cheryl except to say very fruitful meeting, and we will be doing a lot of talking to them in Helsinki, probably in groups as well as individually. There are some action items on a few of us which will go ahead, but by and large we seem to be looking pretty much on schedule. It's going to be a full year. Cheryl, yours.



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Holly. You picked up on the point I simply wanted to make that if anyone that is traveling to Helsinki, we will be very keen to make sure that you get a good 10 or 15 minutes at least with the team from ITEMS that will be there because it will [inaudible] opportunity to get some face-to-face interviews done. So if you're traveling to Helsinki, do expect and please ensure that you do make yourself available for whatever timeslots Gisella and [this team] can put together for you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Any further comments before we go on? Anything from staff? Seeing nothing, our next agenda item is to welcome Rinalia here. I believe she will be talking about the Amsterdam meetings that she participated in, but I will leave it completely up to her how to use her time. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Very well.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Great. The Board met in Amsterdam last week. I think I'm still a bit jet lagged from that. It was a three-day meeting as usual. We typically meet six times a year: three times in conjunction with ICANN meetings and three times outside of that. We normally have our meetings divided into

---

workshops and formal meetings. In workshops, we go a lot deeper and go broader than what we normally do.

For this particular meeting, I was part of a team that actually developed the agenda and program, which is a first for the Board because before this it was typically the Board chair that developed such a program and agenda. But I think that the Board wanted more intensity. It wanted to have a better blend and balance between strategy and operational items. So a small team was put together comprising Cherine Chalaby, George Sadowsky, Ram Mohan, and myself. We worked with Steve Crocker to essentially come up with the program. I'm very happy to receive the feedback that the Board felt it was the best workshop that they've ever had.

In terms of the main issues that we focused on, naturally we focused a lot on the transition. We typically receive reports and updates on what's happening to highlight on what's potentially problematic, what we need to look out for.

We also focused a lot on the CEO, given that it was Göran's first engagement with the Board formally. We wanted to understand what he has learned from observing and learning and also what his priorities would be going forward into the future. We initiated a discussion with him about what his priorities could be, and he will come back with a proposal so that we can finalize that as part of his goals and targets which the compensation committee will then monitor and evaluate.

---

We also discussed the Bylaws and also the principles of cross-community working groups in general. I think you will see Board participation and discussion about this in Helsinki.

There was, I think, an excellent session on trust and transparency, and I think you would have seen the results of that, where we passed a motion and a resolution that we wanted this CEO to come back with a plan on how to make the Board meetings more open and more transparent so that the community has a better understanding of what we do and how we go about doing it.

All Board committees met, and we all had various issues to work on. Because of extensive discussions during the formal Board meeting, particularly focused on the moving of the location of ICANN 57, we could not address two topics. One was the volunteer pool discussion and the other one was the evolving [inaudible] structure of ICANN.

Now the volunteer pool topic is something that's very important to me. I'm the Board [inaudible] for that. I think that it's a strategic consideration for ICANN and we as a Board need to pay particular attention to it because the [strains and] the challenges faced by the volunteer pool have an impact on ICANN itself. We will revisit this in Helsinki.

That's all I have. If you have questions, I would be happy to field it. Just one flag: there is one topic that we ask staff to update on, and that's the Key Signing Key rollover. This is going to happen. It will result in breakage in the Internet, and there is considerable worry about how people will react to that when they suddenly realize that something is

---

wrong with the Internet and it's not working. It's possible that the At-Large may have a role in helping raise awareness about this, advising that there's no need to panic and something can be done and what can be done. I think the suggestion was made to David Conrad to reach out to the At-Large and see what you can do to work together to address it, especially from the end user side. So that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Rinalia. Two comments: in terms of the volunteer experience, can you tell us what the plan is going forward? How do you plan to look at whatever you're looking at, and how do you think that's going to affect what we do?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Well, from my side of it, I think that volunteers are a strategic asset to ICANN. But ICANN doesn't have a [full view] of their volunteer pool. There is no clarity in terms of the size. There is no clarity in terms of what percentage of the people who are volunteering are a mature level, who is intermediate, who is beginning. There is no proper tracking, etc. I think the premise of it is to start putting together a baseline and tracking and then identifying what needs to be done to support the volunteers as they move through the ICANN system.

That's how I see it, and we will go into it more when we are in Helsinki. There's nothing fixed or definite yet. This is an introductory discussion with the Board. I think that it's a topic that hasn't been paid much attention to, and I think that's a mistake and it's going on the Board agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. There is a staff initiative. I'm trying to remember what it's called.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's the Stakeholder Journey.

ALAN GREENBERG: The Stakeholder Journey, which I must admit I have not been very impressed by. Among other things, I don't think there has been a real understanding or attempt to understand the range of different types of volunteers we have. That ICANN tends to treat somebody who is paid a half-million dollars a year by their corporation to attend and lobby on ICANN issues the same way as they treat someone who is a true volunteer who is taking vacation time to go to these meetings. I think not differentiating those and at least understanding that their motivations and their resources are so different puts us in a very awkward position. So I hope that your involvement will at least factor in that kind of thing as one of the components.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: That is actually one of the things that I have noted down [inaudible]. Thank you, Alan.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Was there any discussion at all in any of the Board meetings or the Board committee meetings that you're aware of on the At-Large multi-year GA summit proposal?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes. It was raised in the Board Finance Committee discussion, and it was highlighted as an example of a unique proposal. It presents an innovation in the sense that it is a multi-year proposal. All the other proposals are typically not. And it is perceived as the start of a possible series of multi-year proposals from the rest of the community. So the stance is to use the At-Large example as a pilot and to see how it goes and if it is successful, then we might encourage the rest of the community to adopt that as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I was a little worried when I heard the concept of it applies to other groups as well that there would be a desire to say, "Let's not do anything until the other groups also participate." But I do like the idea of it being a pilot and not being delayed until the other groups have time to cobble together their multi-year proposal just so everyone can play in the sandbox.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Right. And we do have to wait until the end of the public comment process before the formal response can be done through the Board Finance Committee and see how they're going to process that.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course. I've been very optimistic that the informal feedback was as positive as it was, even though clearly there are no decisions made at this point.

Any other comments for Rinalia? My God, we're going to be early on everything at this point. That's okay. I'm going to try to slow us down as much as I can. That's a joke.

Anyway, Rinalia, thank you for joining us. The invitation to Rinalia did not go out until very, very late, even though it was actually on our agenda. When I say very late, I mean about 12 hours ago. So I appreciate you being here. I know you've been doing a lot of traveling right now, so you're probably close to exhausted if not past that. So thank you for joining us, and I think that's been a useful set of interactions.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: My pleasure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any last comments on this point before we go on to the next one?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to say thank you very much, Rinalia.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Rinalia says, "Thank you. You're welcome."

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Holly.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I wasn't prompting you. I was just moving on the agenda.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's nice to hear the voice anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, our next item, Item 11, is At-Large at ICANN 56 in Helsinki. I will turn it over to Gisella Gruber. I haven't heard Gisella, but I presume she's on the call.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. Yes, I'm here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. So we need to, among other things, do a little bit of checking on what Maureen had mentioned. I will comment before you start that, as many of you know, the Intellectual Property Constituency did approach us about having a joint session.

In history, At-Large has worked closely with the Intellectual Property Constituency in years gone past. We haven't done much together recently, and the chair of the constituency felt that maybe it was time to see if there were common areas or, if not, at least understand each



---

other in areas where we do diverge. There was a very positive response from a number of ALAC members, so we're trying to schedule that. We've come up with a couple of topics, and if we can find a common time to meet, which is not clear yet, we will be meeting in Helsinki.

With that, I'll go back to you, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. We put the updated schedule on the Adobe Connect and I'll also send you the link to the main schedule which is open to all for you to see it if you prefer it being directly on your browsers. Bear with me for a second. There, you've got the link that has come in.

What I've done here is I've updated this schedule with everything that was sent through last week. Apologies for the delay, but I was actually on vacation last week so I updated this last night with what we have, including what Maureen said. As you'll see, this is split over a couple of pages. I'm going to give you sync rights that everyone can scroll through the schedule as we go through it.

Seun has just told me that he has lost audio, so we will dial back out to him. Thank you.

There hasn't been much change on the ALAC sessions except for the Monday afternoon there has been a change with the second cross-community working sessions, which both of those afternoon sessions we will have as non-conflicting. As you can see, no other ALAC session has been put in parallel with the CCWG and IANA Accountability sessions nor with the PDP on Next Generation gTLD Registrations, etc.

---

We are still trying to schedule on Monday a one-hour meeting with the GAC. As it stands now, we're looking at a meeting during the lunch break, but this will be confirmed either later today or hopefully tomorrow.

On the Tuesday, again the two afternoon sessions are currently non-conflicting, but we have an e-mail that Maureen sent through. If you can see it, it's in green. This will be parallel to the PDP New gTLD Subsequent Procedures. Maureen, if you would like to give more details on the session that is running that afternoon. As per your recent e-mail, perhaps we can have part of the ALAC members attending the ccNSO, GAC, and ALAC meeting. Maureen, would you like to comment on that?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Gisella, for that opportunity. I'm just looking for the information. Can you move on? I'll find it.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Oh, sorry. Sorry to put you on the spot there, Maureen. Absolutely. On the Tuesday evening, according to the new schedule, what they will be doing in Helsinki is having cocktails on the Tuesday and Wednesday evening because there have been several requests from several of the groups. So there will be Monday evening, the reception at the City of Helsinki City Hall, which is by the City of Helsinki, so not by ICANN. Tuesday and Wednesday, there will be cocktails, and the format is that it's going to be in a foyer area. So we can still have some groups meeting even though it is called the President's Reception.

---

We will no doubt have this in conjunction with the EURALO and Civil Society Networking event as we can have a corner section with maybe even a signpost to say that is the EURALO and Civil Society Networking event.

On the Tuesday evening, we are working on finalizing a meeting for the ISOC-ers. They'll be working in conjunction with [inaudible] and then possibly a [inaudible] jamming sessions like there was in Marrakech. Details still to come. We're just working on the logistics.

On Wednesday, and this will then blend in with Maureen coming in again, the afternoon sessions, none are conflicting except again for the session that Maureen has come up with, which is the ccNSO, GAC, GNSO, ALAC Forum, which will be against the PDP Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms, etc. Again, I will let Maureen speak about that, but in the e-mail that she sent us, she would again like to have some of the ALAC members attend the forum and the others could go to the main cross-community session.

On the Wednesday evening, we have the Chairman's Reception, which again is a cocktail, again allowing for a lot of networking opportunities. No news at this stage yet about the DNS Women's event.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, we're going to have. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, it is on. It's [inaudible] and will be in the bar next [inaudible]. I can send more details later.

GISELLA GRUBER: Vanda, thank you very much for the information. If you send me the details, I'll update the schedule and make sure that everyone is aware of it, [inaudible] the ladies of course. Thank you very much.

Then again in the Thursday, the afternoon sessions, if you read them, they will be non-conflicting as well.

What is outstanding now, as Alan said, is the meeting with the IPC. Please, any of the ALAC working sessions and working groups as of today are not set in stone because we're trying to schedule the GAC meeting, the meeting with the IPC, and we'll need to juggle a few sessions around over the next 48 hours. But over the next 48 hours, we should pretty much have, not a definite, but a working schedule because we have to submit the meeting forms with the meetings team.

Maureen, would you like to just speak more about the two afternoon sessions?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Gisella, yes. Sorry for not being organized here. The first session, which is actually one that currently conflicts with another meeting that has been planned for the ALAC on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, which is unfortunate but it is the time that the

---

ccNSO and the GAC were to be meeting anyway so that's not something that I think that they could change.

But it was to hear the results of a survey that the GAC undertook for their ccTLDs. I thought that might be of interest to us because we have actually been looking in the past at getting our ALSes more engaged with their ccTLDs. I thought it might be of interest to some ALAC members who are involved with ccTLDs to hear the results of the GAC survey.

The second part of that meeting was to discuss the PDP on the Review Mechanism for Decisions on Delegation, [inaudible], and Requirement of ccTLDs. Again, that's of interest I know to some ALAC members.

The second meeting was a meeting that again conflicts with another ALAC meeting, but this one involves both the GAC and the GNSO looking at the issues relating to country and territory names. Cheryl is already a member of that group and will no doubt participate. But it is something that we made a comment on as one of our statements and our many ALAC members participated in that commentary, so again it was I thought another meeting opportunity for ALAC to be involved in.

So I guess it's a call that we will make individually, but I think it's important that the ALAC is notified if you're available to attend. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Maureen. If I may interject, the ccNSO GAC meeting sounds like there has been some miscommunication. That was listed on

---

previous agendas in the first session of the afternoon against the auction funds drafting team, and that makes a lot of sense because the GAC has requested that we meet with them prior to the gTLD session because that's the sessions they wanted to consult with us on.

So it sounds rather unusual if the GAC has decided to meet with the ccNSO in parallel with the session that they wanted to talk to us about because they wanted us to have perhaps a united front going into that session. So I'm just wondering, is that green box in the wrong place. In the previous schedules, it was in the 15:15 to 16:45 session. Gisella, do you have anything or do you actually have hard information saying it's in that session?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, just bear with me for a second. The green boxes have been placed according to Maureen's information. If you just bear with me for a second. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Certainly on the link you gave us, it was on the earlier session, not this one.

[MAUREEN HILYARD]:

And I was just taking my information from what I got from [Alejandro].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. In a meeting earlier today of the [inaudible] country and territory names working group, which is why I put my hand up – I'll come back to that later – we were looking at from the ccNSO the timeslots. Where that green box is on Tuesday is indeed my memory from this morning, so there may very well have been a change. For what confusion and reason, I'm not sure, but certainly timeslot does mesh with my memory of looking at the schedule we were presented with by the ccNSO this morning at the joint meeting between GNSO and ccNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it remains to be seen how this plays out then because if that's an important thing for the GAC other than a few people, I'm not quite sure how they're going to resolve that with the gTLD session. But I guess, Gisella, if you could reach out to the GAC staff and verify independently that they think that's where it is also.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, I will reach out to GAC staff for the Tuesday afternoon session. That is the information I've got, even though it does say "TBC," which was the information that was sent through. So the TBC may well be that it might change, so I'll follow up on that.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Just in general, I'll reinforce what Gisella said about the ALAC sessions. At this point, we are trying to accommodate the joint sessions, and we have told both the GAC and the IPC that we will be flexible. We will move whatever we need to, to try to get those sessions and then reassign other sessions. So we may well find, for instance, that one of the afternoon community sessions which the ALAC has said is not of great interest, and we did do a poll of that a little while ago, may well get allocated as a working session for instance to make sure that we do have sufficient time to address all the issues we want to address in Helsinki.

Cheryl, your hand is still up. Is that a new one or an old one?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is a continuing one. Thanks you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then the floor is yours.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you so much, good sir. Just going back to why I put my hand up, it wasn't concerning what I knew from this morning's scheduling event, I just wanted to point out, and it could very well be that the Tuesday afternoon session between GAC and the ccNSO as a public forum may only engage part of the Government Advisory Committee being a reminder of the survey work that they've done.



---

But it would be good, as Maureen said, if we could have some people in the room, particularly when we think of the work done ages ago now when [Rudy] worked with Ron in the role with exchange liaisons and we mapped the At-Large Structures, Government Advisory Committee, country representatives, [inaudible] territory representatives or organizational representatives, though we were just starting to have those in those dim, dark, distant days, and [seek] the [NSO] members at that time and that data still exists, so we might find that's an easy refresh.

I know Maureen is familiar with that, but it would be good to have a few people in that room. Unfortunately, I won't be amongst them because of the competing timeslot with the other PDP working group.

But I also wanted to make an appeal for us to, if at all possible, encourage our people to be in the room for the Wednesday afternoon session on the [inaudible] country and territory names. It's a pivotal point in the work of that working group, Alan. What we've done to date is deal with and work with the community in calling out the survey and public comment on the use of two- and three-character names.

But right now, we have this 90-minute session as an opportunity to try and interact with the community in a more dynamic way to put us in the right direction toward the next steps, which will include some of the more generic uses and not just strictly related to ISO [inaudible], etc. So I'm just suggesting that it is one that, if we can get people in the room for it, it would be very useful. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. When is that meeting?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is the Wednesday afternoon session with the ccNSO, which I believe is the [pre-afternoon] [wrap-up] session. So the one that wraps up at 4:45.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's the one we have marked as the ALAC wrap-up session.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Unfortunately, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Rather unfortunate because, you're right, that is a session that we have had people somewhat intrigued in if not directly commenting on. So, Gisella, if we can flag that and I doubt if we can change it, but let's at least be conscious of it.

Any further comment on the agenda? Do we have any updates on Outreach and Engagement activities, be them as they are in the meeting? I believe last time I was involved in a discussion, we were limiting our outreach and engagement activities to NextGen and Fellows. Is that where we still stand? Heidi, are you with us?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. Sorry, I thought Gisella was going to take that. Yes, so basically you could think of them as three. The first one will be a session with the subcommittee on outreach and engagement just with the NextGen. That is going to be Monday morning. That's going to be a 35,000-foot level introduction to ICANN At-Large. That will be followed after the break by an ALAC session with the Fellows, a deeper dive into At-Large. I think the format is being developed for that. Then Tuesday evening, there's going to be EURALO/Civil Society Networking event in the evening as Gisella mentioned. That's an outreach. Both groups that identify as civil society as well as the Fellows and NextGen-ers will be invited to that session as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. The concern I've raised before, and I trust it is being considered as the detail planning be done, that in the session with the Fellows that we make sure that the meeting is structured so that this will be a productive use of all 25-27 travelers that we do have in Helsinki. And if that's not the case, then we should clearly identify it and try to make sure that there are other things that worthy to focus on. But we should know going into it whether this is the whole ALAC or a partial ALAC. Any other comments on agendas? We are a little bit ahead of time at this point, which is good.

Next item is Revised Expected Standards of Behavior. If we could...

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes? Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. Just two more items under that larger agenda item.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, sorry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: The first one is just the identification of policy issues, if ALAC is in a position to start considering what the policy issues, the hot topics, etc. that you will be discussing there. That is important as we start preparing for our briefings. The second point is just very quickly on the process of inviting Board members. I can take that one, if you'd like.

ALAN GREENBERG: You mean you can take it, meaning you want to discuss it now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I can just mention what that is going to be.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can, please discuss that, and I will also add something to it, but go ahead first.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, the process for identification and inviting of Board members to the AC/SO groups will be done through support staff working with the Board support staff, and just to let you know that's how we're going to be asking all AC/SOs to move forward on inviting Board members to the various meetings. Again, at meeting B there will be no formal Board meeting with each AC/SO, it will be where ACs can invite particular Board members to participate in their session. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. On both of those items, number one, in terms of what you called hot topics, the policy issues we want on our agenda, I am welcoming – the decision on what we talk about does not have to be solely mine or the ALTs or staff. If anyone wants to make sure that coming out of Helsinki we have had a significant amount of time to talk about any given subject, please raise that. There's no guarantee we can do anything, but if you don't raise it, there's a good chance it will not be discussed. So that's a responsibility on all ALAC members, and for that matter, all RALO leaders. Please, make sure that if you have something you want to see discussed, it is on the agenda, or at least we try to fit it into the agenda.

In terms of Board participation, I do recall that I have heard a number of Board members say they think this is a really silly idea, having Board members sit in on our other discussions, and I specifically recall our Board member suggesting that if we want a meeting with the Board, we should simply ask for it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. If I may –

ALAN GREENBERG: The official plan notwithstanding, we need to speak up and say what we want. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. The process has just recently been discussed among staff, and that process is going to be the way, I believe, going forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Certainly, until we come up with specific topics, I don't know how we can invite Board members, and I'm not sure which Board members are the right ones and would want to be there for those topics in any case. So it's an interesting idea, but not one that I would have come up with. But I do welcome input from other people. Please, contribute to this, your input will contribute to how successful this meeting is.

Rinalia has said some of them may show up based on their own interest, and that's fine. I'm delighted to have Board members wander in and then tell us the meeting was great or the meeting was boring, or actually contribute to the meeting.

Of course, we're expecting Rinalia to be there 24 hours a day for our meetings.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yeah, right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which Rinalia has already told me don't expect. She may want to find out what other people are actually doing. You know, the interesting stuff. Sorry, I'm getting a little bit slap happy at this point.

Any other comments on the meeting before we go on to the next item? Before I try for the second time to go on to the next item. Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we are on the next item: the Revised Expected Standards of Behavior.

As we're getting this up, let me recount the story. As you all know, there was an incident which caused a lot of discussion at the last ICANN meeting, and there was a staff-led initiative to consult with the community and decide how we address the changing our standards of behavior. There were a number of suggestions, several of which included forming cross-community groups. Not formal CCWGs in the sense of Accountability or IANA, but cross-community groups to come up and invent something.

A survey was done, and I'm delighted that the ALAC comments were almost all universally – with one exception – that we should simply do something lightweight, this is not rocket science, there are plenty of examples in the world, we do not need to constitute a CCWG to deliberate for six months with expert legal help and expert funded help

---

from outside, that staff should simply work with whatever experts they could find, come up with something and put it out for public comment.

To my somewhat great surprise, that is exactly what they did. The comments that I received from various people were interesting in terms of the concept of forming a CCWG to deliberate on this, and the examples were – this sounds like a question of how many ICANNers does it take to screw in a light bulb, and someone's suggesting that perhaps we could simply put something and post it on the wall at work. It worked for her child's undergrad or elementary school class, why wouldn't it work for us? But in fact, that is exactly what they're doing, and something has been worded that is out for public comment. Pretty sure we will say we support this.

There are other aspects which are not included in the standards of behavior, which I believe ICANN does need to do. We do need to put in place processes for what people do if they feel they have been harassed and how we handle those. Perhaps what action we can take against someone if indeed they're deemed to have treated someone else improperly.

The last thing is a consciousness-raising effort to make sure that people understand what we're talking about. I don't think some of these things are well understood, certainly with people from certain backgrounds, and it's a moderately complex issue. I think we have to acknowledge the fact that part of it is not necessarily people acting improperly knowingly, but not understanding what is proper and what isn't. Any comments on this? Go ahead, Cheryl.



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Not surprisingly, I suppose to anyone who knows me well or was around at the last meeting, I'm very keen to have us support the changes that have been proposed in the draft [text] that's out for public comment. For anyone who doesn't follow every page of every wiki activity that's ever done by anybody, I just wanted to note for the record that I've put onto the wiki page regarding this particular public comment today some – what I think are words of wisdom, and Alan, I'll let you follow it up with that, thank you very much – that I think we're putting [inaudible] to use that modality to make some comments as well. But I also wanted to mention that at the recent Asia Pacific Regional At-Large Organization, the APRALO call, we did raise, and in principle, support the fact that as one of the regions with probably – we would argue – the greatest diversity in terms of culture and expected norms of behavior, we would be very keen to see some additional material, actions, activities, enablers, facilitators, whatever we want to talk about be developed with the community in the coming months and perhaps even years, and make sure that this is not just a simple tick and flick, where we put a few words into our expected standards of behavior and leave it at that. We think it's a matter that needs a – not massive, but consistent work and review, because it is very much one of huge differences in expectations and norms, which will vary over culture and the diversity that we have. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Any other comments? I'll share something. One of the things that struck me in having discussions with a number of people

---

---

is there are a number of people in our community – women – who, when I meet them for the first time in an ICANN meeting, we hug, and that is not deemed to be harassment as far as I can tell by those particular people. Yet clearly, if I went up to a random person I'd never met before and did it, that would be less than appropriate.

So it's not intuitively obvious, it's hard to put words down to describe this kind of thing. So I really think we do need some level of education, or at least awareness of what we are talking about that can be perceived as being harassment, depending on the circumstances and details. Cheryl, is that a new hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It is, Alan. Just on that matter alone, it also depends on where we're meeting, as there will be places within certainly our Asia Pacific region, and quite specifically many of them in the western edges of our geo region where public display of affection is simply culturally inappropriate in that city, state or territory that we're meeting in.

So again, we have to watch a lot and modify a lot depending on where we are and what we're doing. That doesn't mean that I won't welcome a shaking of the hand and a nice hug and a peck on the cheek in the confines of the ICANN meeting, but we do need to be aware that there are some places where that would be actually highly doubtful, even legal to do in public. It's an awareness issue, and it's a sensibility issue. It's certainly not one that we should take lightly, but it's also certainly one that we need to work on sensibly.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl, for adding another level of confusion and complexity to this situation. But indeed, you're right. Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, good. Thank you for the comments, I just want to bring the attention to a section of the edits, which is referring to unwelcome, that is harassment that is considered unwelcome. That particular part is what I think [whoever] is actually making the decision that it is indeed harassment or not, we'll have specific, more detailed process by which things will be called unwelcome, because for instance, just like you said, someone who are already used to, who has probably hugged at the time, if the person – also it then comes to the part that who blows the whistle of harassment [inaudible] that you are related with or someone [inaudible].

So I think those details need to also be [cleared] if a relation with somebody – if that party does not make a call for harassment, if the person who I'm related with can make such call. So I think those details do need to be looked into yet, but generally, there needs to be [inaudible] that makes sure that a guy, for instance – of course, it's always been women, women – a guy also does not become the victim,

---

especially if what he has done is not with bad intent. So I think it needs to be on both sides. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Seun. I think you're identifying some of the difficulty in this. Unwelcome is very much a judgment call, and there are certainly situations where someone who was the object of the suggested harassment might not feel comfortable in making a complaint, but somebody else might. Similarly, the fact that someone is harassed does not mean that the person doing it thought that they were harassing someone. There's a significant problem – as I was mentioning – of people understanding what is deemed appropriate or not. This is a complex issue, and simple words and a policy don't address it completely. Jimmy, go ahead.

JIMMY SCHULZ:

Hi, I have two items. First, I would plead to that the wording, the sexual orientation not mix up with sexual identity, which is [inaudible] in the respect part, and in the treat part it's only sexual orientation. If you read the Wikipedia article on that, we should use sexual identity, I think, which is the correct wording here. That's point one. Point two is adding to what all the others already said about conflict potential, because if somebody doesn't even know that behavior is harassing, we have to learn that, and then maybe go on, but there is a substantial possibility of conflict of interest between freedom of speech, and maybe not cultural, but political behavior, if you act, for example, [inaudible]. Because freedom of speech, of course, in some parts of the world is very

---

important, and not very well accepted in other parts. There, we should have a fundamental decision on how we see that, because I don't want just not to harass someone while [inaudible] cut my right of freedom of my word. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Jimmy. May I ask that you and anyone who has any substantive thoughts on this to actually put them on the wiki, so that when we come to the point of drafting something, we have all of the input there. With that, if there's no one else who has any further comments – I see no hands, I've heard no other voices, we will go onto the next item.

And the next item is – just for the record, we are currently a little bit behind time at this point, and the next item is the Fiscal Year Request. Heidi, would you like to take that? And if we can reduce it from the 15 minutes, that would be good, but if not, [inaudible] there.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I'm going to reduce it considerably. So just to let everyone know, the results of the fiscal year '17 special requests have been announced, they are on the wiki page. Yeşim, could you put that in the chat? I'm just going to very briefly go over some of the highlights of what was approved and some of the details.

For the first point of the strategy session for the ALAC was approved, but the facilitator will need to be staff, an internal person, so as we start

---

implementing that, that might be staff or it might be some of the more experienced people within the ALAC who wish to carry that forward.

Then the development sessions for the ALAC and the RALOs were both approved, they will be taking place on the Friday of meeting C, and again, there will be I believe food for that, as well as for the strategy session, as well as staff and internal facilitators for both of those sessions.

In terms of general assemblies, there were three requests: one AFRALO, one LACRALO, and one from NARALO. The result was that two were approved, so that gives a little bit of work to the ALAC, looking at the regions and selecting which two will be approved for that.

I'm just going through some of the larger ones. The captioning project was approved, but not in its full format that it was requested. Basically, the current program will be extended for another six calls. There was a request for captioning into Spanish and French, but that was not approved.

The request for the – I'm getting [inaudible] a little bit – the request for the NARALO travel ambassadorship, that was approved, so that was approved in the form of two travelers, two ambassadors to travel to ICANN 57, which, again, is taking place in Hyderabad, India in November, and that format will be under sort of the guise of the mentorship program. So some mentorship activates prior to that meeting, and then mentorship during ICANN 57.

I think those were the real highlights. The full requests and full details have been posted into the chat, so we can go through that, if you would

---

like. I think those are really the main ones that stick out to me. There was a request for the RALOs to have some discretionary funding. That was not approved, but what was approved was that they would be working with the GSE teams in their region, and there was some funding allocated to that for those types of activates. I think those are the highlights.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, thank you, Heidi. Two points: I'm delighted that they accepted [Loris's] program and linked it essentially into mentorship. That is, we're not just sending people to meetings, we're sending them there and want to work to make sure that it is an effective interaction. That's really positive, and I like the idea that the GSE in response to the almost continual barrage of things that we're doing – to say "Well, this seems to be something GSE could fund," they've actually asked for some money to help us fund things, so they actually have a pot of money and they don't have to scramble each time.

Now, of course, figuring out exactly how to use that money and whose applications to respond to could be the equivalent of another CROPP program. I'm hoping we don't have to build it up into a significant infrastructure required to do it, but it's something that will require a bit of talking within the ALAC.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. I want to express my [keenness] to see that some of our requests are now accepted under the GSE department. That means that the money that's put there is now part of the core budget of

---

ICANN, and we don't have to – in the future, I think – make special requests for them.

This is what I want us to tend to, because each time we have to make requests and we have to [inaudible] a competition, a very huge competition. There is only six. As you know, there is an envelope for that, and all people have to be inside this envelope, so when some parts of our requests are now put in the core budget, it is a very good thing, and we have to lobby to make it a standing activity, and not a special event.

Second point, there are two workshops in IGF approved, the APRALO and AFRALO ones, so this is also something which is very good, and I hope that our workshops will be accepted by the [inaudible] at the IGF. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. One of the real positive things about the GSE asking for funds on our behalf or to use for our behalf is not only does it make funds actually available that can be dispersed, but it changes the timelines completely. We don't have to do things on a fiscal year basis, it can be done on an ad hoc basis a lot quicker. And this money is largely to help fund local events and things like that. I think those are the words that were associated with it. Heidi, is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, Alan.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: So it's not more CROPP travel funds, but it's to "You're holding a meeting, can we do something? Can we help organize something?" And it can be done on much shorter notice than the regular budget requests, so I think that's really positive. Any other comments on budget items?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, just as I'm typing in the chat, I didn't take the time to go through all of those that were approved – the RALO requests, and please, do take the time to go through that full list, and even where it says no for some of the RALO requests, you'll see that in parentheses there is some funding allocated to that, and that is through the GSE, and that's just the greater collaboration with At-Large and GSE. So, many of those that say no, they can still move ahead. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you, Heidi. Last year, certainly, there were a number where in my opinion the answers were wrong. That is, they gave an answer which either didn't make any sense or showed they didn't understand the project properly, so I do suggest that everyone go through the list, especially look at the ones that your RALOs – or if they're ALAC ones, the ALAC requested, and make sure you're happy with the answer.

---

There is no formal appeal process, but there are certainly informal processes we can go through if you feel that the answer was – not necessarily you just didn't like it, but there was an implication that it was not well understood.

So please, do your homework and make sure that we don't have any things in the background saying we weren't dealt with fairly but didn't do anything about it. We do need to respond if indeed there are things like that. I haven't had time to look at them in detail, so there may not be any, but please. Any further at last items on budget?

All right, the next item is potentially a two-part item, and it is the discussion on the selection by the ALAC of the NomCom delegates who were recommended by the regions.

If you recall, the process is regions may give us one or sometimes more candidates which to accept. The ALAC then has to either ratify those, or replace them with somebody else. We have, on occasion, done that. Of for some reason the candidate was believed by the ALAC to not be suitable, they have been replaced, and at times, RALOs have not been in position to make a single recommendation, but they have made multiple ones and we have picked among them. So we have full discretion to do that, with full understanding that if we reject a RALO candidate, there may well be a reaction to that, but nevertheless.

The item was put on the agenda partly at the request of Sébastien, and I would like to call upon Sébastien to raise the issues he wanted to. This is an open, public discussion at this point. It is not a discussion of individuals. We will go in, in camera with just the ALAC and ICANN body

---

liaisons if necessary, to discuss individuals, but those discussions will not be held in a public forum. So I open the floor to Sébastien, or anyone else who wants to raise any issues about this. Is Sébastien still on the call with us? Yes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I am. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Yes, I wanted to discuss with ALAC, and as Alan said, I will not talk about people, but a more general point of view. The process where we are, we have a proposal by each region, and of course, as it is by each region, it's balanced regionally. But if you look to the candidates, the other point of diversity, and specifically the gender balance is not here. I was wondering if we don't need to look at that and discuss this issue as ALAC.

We can understand that each region, they have the choice for one person and they pick the one they think is a good one, but as a general point of view, we as ALAC need to have some choice. I am not here discussing the process even if I think we need to change it, maybe in the future to ask each region to propose to ALAC both one male and one female, and maybe with some differences at the sub regional level and so on and so forth, but to give us as ALAC more choice.

---

But here, we are faced with a [group.] If we send those people, that will be four male and one female, and that's not a good balance from my point of view. I don't know how we can solve that, but I wanted to weigh this issue before we make any decision and if we have to make changes, yes, we will discuss that in camera, but for the moment, it's a global point of view. I hope it's clear, and if it's not, I am available to answer any question. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Here, I'm reverting to the [inaudible] distant day when I chaired the Nominating Committee. Whilst I think everyone would also recognize I have a particularly vested interest in gender equity, I am not in any way as concerned as Sébastien is in the fact of this particular appointment. Let me explain to you why.

The five regional seats that are voting seats on the Nominating Committee are five out of a total of 27 seats around the table. We could send five women and still have no gender equity in the Nominating Committee as a result of our actions.

So I appreciate and would certainly endorse and encourage it to try and help gender equity and [inaudible] diversity on other matters in all the appointments we consider, but it really has got to be one of the best for the job. Now, that said, in recent times, the Nominating Committee has found [inaudible] getting better in its own gender equity, but more

---

importantly, it is a mandate of the Nominating Committee regardless of what chromosomes they happen to carry, that they look specifically at gender as a diversity factor with the appointments they make. And I'll point out that it's not necessarily a follow that if you have a gender balanced group, you result in gender balanced appointments. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I've put my hand up, but I'm going to go to the end of the queue and let other people speak first. Alberto next.

INTERPRETER: This is Alberto Soto for the record. Sorry, I was muted. Thank you very much. Well, I believe this gender issue is going to be quite difficult, because for example in LACRALO, during the last four years, we have female representation. After that, we have to take into account gender representation in combination with other RALOs as well. That's my comment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I heard the comments made by Cheryl, but I think if each group don't do their own work, and at the end, yes, the global Nominating Committee will less balance, and it's why I think we need to do our own job. That's part of what I think we need to do, specifically

---

regarding gender – as Cheryl said – equity. Maybe it's a better word than balance, I don't know, but I think we need to think about that question.

Because at the end, we take the same type of example in other bodies, and as it's done, we may end up with one single region represented in some groups, all men or all women, and all that needs to be changed in ICANN in the future. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. This issue of gender balance is very dear for me. I'm one of those who would love for having gender balance, but in this particular case, I don't think it is relevant to impose anything, because of all those people, we need people who – those people who select members of the Board and leaders, let's say, of ICANN. What is needed is to have people who, first, know better people. Second, have more maturity. Third, are more balanced, they're not extremists, etc.

So when you know at AFRALO level the selection, which is very important for us, is this delegate to the NomCom, we always try to be very careful to select the right one, because the impact of this person is very important on the whole ICANN. For example, we had Fatima there for two years, and I am too happy for that. Now we have a man. I think that the balance at the level of the NomCom, if you want, the end balance of the Board for example, the end balance of gender in the

---

Board is not the result of an imbalanced NomCom. I think that the NomCom should be – there are, if you want, requirements for the NomCom and we need to meet them.

So you may not find a man for it in a group, and you may not find a woman in a group – for this year, I mean, for the moment. So I think that we have to be more careful about it. For the NomCom, it is more important to have the right person than to have a man or a woman. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Tijani. I'll point out that we have the luxury of having five people from the ALAC. Not every group has that luxury, and in fact, most of them only have one. So clearly, other groups are not in a position to gender balance or anything else balance the people they name to the group.

I see Sébastien's hand up, so Sébastien, please go ahead first, and I'll try to summarize at the end.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. I see that I am the only one with this position, but I really think that we need to show the good direction for At-Large. And please, I am sure that in each region, we are able to find the right candidates man and the right candidates woman. I am sure that we can do that. Then, at the level of ALAC, we can balance the people we ask to be at the NomCom. You can't tell us that if we have just men, they will

---

do the best choice for ICANN. No, it's not possible. We need really to take that into account.

But I see that we don't agree with that. I understand, but please, we need to find a way to go in that direction, and we need to show to the ICANN that we can do good decision on balance. And once again, please don't tell me that we can't find the right people. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Okay, back at my comment. If we could have staff try to find where that noise is coming from. And it seems to be gone now.

At this point, clearly, there's not a lot we can do for this meeting, at least I don't believe so. We did not provide any instructions to the RALOs on diversity, we did not provide any options, and I'm going to suggest something that we could in the future, should we wish to. So I would think that there's not a lot of call for doing anything at this point. I tend to be more worried – and this is sort of implied by Cheryl – as to the attitudes of the people, and not necessarily the attributes of the person themselves.

In one particular case, I know of a NomCom appointee from the ALAC who has been – I won't say accused, but had, in the carrying out of their duties, made sexist comments. Those kinds of statements, those kind of actions I find are far worse than being of the wrong gender, because that reflects directly on how one may go through the process of selecting people for the various bodies. And I think we may want to



---

think about how we set criteria for NomCom appointees, which is different than what we do right now.

To be candid, we very often pick someone who used to be in some position of authority within a RALO or in the ALAC and now doesn't have travel funding anymore, and this is a way of keeping someone involved. That's probably a better way than our earlier technique of getting someone involved for the first time in ICANN by putting them on the NomCom, when they knew nothing about the overall environment at all and we then asked them to make decisions on behalf of ICANN.

So perhaps we've gotten better. I think we need to think about it, and I see some hands up, but let me finish, and then we'll go on to the other people in the queue. I would suggest we want to discuss – not now, but well before the next process – whether we want to continue the current process we have or do something different. The words in the bylaw say the ALAC selects the people after consultation with the RALO. It does not say the RALO makes a recommendation and we simply rubber stamp it or reject it.

We could do other things. We could ask each RALO for three names, and to just explain what the various characteristics are, and then the ALAC will try to find the best set among them that will equalize the various characteristics we're looking at in NomCom appointees. And we'll point out that if we do that, that's a lot of work we're going to have to do, because the ALAC or a trusted subcommittee of the ALAC will have to do a lot of homework to these people to make the recommendations to the ALAC as to what to do.

---

So if we do that, we're taking on a whole pile of work, and we have to be prepared to carry it out diligently if we do that, but it's something we could consider, should we want to go forward, but I don't think that it's applicable to this year.

I see Seun has his hand up. Go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yes. You touched on my point, especially on the context I will agree that there's nothing we can do at this particular one. However, on the next one as well, when are we going to try to discuss it? I really doubt there's anything you can still do about it, especially if you're looking [inaudible] one, we're looking to allow the community that is the region to actually do the bulk of the work, and not ALAC do the bulk of the work. I think there is the [clause] in allowing the region to do it, because it should be a consensus view of the region most likely. We can always encourage them to be mindful of gender balance [inaudible] the nominee, and then [instead of] election, have a recommendation. [inaudible] you check from each of the five regions and try to see whether they're gender balanced or not.

We can't see while the selection process is still going on at ALAC, we can't see why people are getting nomination in their region, [inaudible] so we can encourage each region to try to be mindful of balance. However, the balance that we will be talking about is not just gender, but other balances like languages, culture. Those are more critical than gender for me inside of a region. [inaudible] balance may be more important. Overall, this shouldn't be about [competence].

---

ALAC would also be considering balance at a level, at ALAC's level. The balance ALAC would be considering could be balance of newbies. Okay, within the five regions, should we encourage three from the region who are already [inaudible] or two from other regions who are still going to be part of it and who will learn from the process? These are some of the balance that we at ALAC could do. For the other balance, balancing the [others'] choice, I think we should leave it to the region. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Seun. A couple of comments, because I do feel strongly about this. I personally will object. I don't have any veto rights, but I would personally object very strongly if we reverted back to what we did for a while, that is use NomCom as a way of introducing people into ICANN. The rest of ICANN put their most experienced people on the Nominating Committee, who are in a position to judge what ICANN needs. I think we need to do the same thing too, and I would strongly object to an attempt to go back to using it as a learning experience for ICANN. That's number one.

Number two, this is an ALAC responsibility to name with consultation. We have, in the last several years, given the RALOs a fair amount of discretion in naming a single person. I think this is a discussion that we may choose to have, and allow Sébastien later in the year to suggest that it be raised for a substantive discussion at an ALAC meeting – not at Helsinki, but perhaps the next one – and to identify whether we want to take on the responsibility more seriously of doing the selection ourselves, and ask the RALO for more general input as opposed to

---

naming a second person. But we can't come to closure on this at this particular time, but it is something of great merit.

I have taken an initiative over the last number of months to try to get the delegates to the NomCom to be more actively involved in ALAC events. They can't share with us the candidates they're evaluating, because there are confidentiality issues, but I really believe that we should not name a Nominating Committee delegate who then disappears for a year, other than sending out the monthly reports which are handed to them to send out. So I really would like to see more interaction. I want opportunities for the ALAC to provide input to these people for what we are looking for in directors, or in ALAC members for that matter.

So you're going to see these people more in the future than we have in the past, and I recommend interacting with them. At this point, I don't know if anyone wants to go into closed session. I will tell you, I did have one comment, one set of input about one of the candidates who was deemed by the people who talked to be to not be someone we wanted to endorse. I have done some background checking, and I feel that I don't feel comfortable in raising the issue at this point, so I have no reason to go into in camera, but if any ALAC member believes we should have an in camera discussion on the actual candidates that we will be endorsing, then please identify that now and we will go into an in camera session.

Jimmy says not needed. Sébastien agrees. We are just over time and I'm told we have 10 to 15 minutes if necessary. At this point, nobody has given an indication that we want an in camera session, so there will not

---

be an in camera session on this, and we will start a vote to ratify the five candidates that have been recommended by the regions in the very near future.

Last item is Any Other Business. I have one item for any other business. Does anyone else have one? I see no hands. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, but it may be put in a discussion at another meeting. I still feel very troubled with what is done with civil society issue, and I get more and more the impression that there are some wish to put together ALAC, At-Large and NCSG people in one basket named civil society. I really think that it's a reverse within At-Large. We have civil society participants, but not just only. I really would like to have some time to discuss that in-depth, and I don't think that it's good to be run by staff to go in one direction. If we agree, formally, I have no problem. For the moment, we just follow what is done, and I really think we need to have an in-depth discussion of that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sébastien. Heidi, may I ask? We have an action item to make sure on the Helsinki agenda there is a discussion of the ALAC without participants from other parts of ICANN. Not a closed meeting, but not attended explicitly by speakers from either GSE or the other constituencies, so that we can have a discussion within the ALAC and RALO representatives of where we want to go on this.

---

My other item on the agenda is simply a question for Ariel. We have several RALO elections that are going on which are just about to close. Are there any at this point which are still under quorate?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. There's only one poll that's under quorate, and it's the EURALO's poll. They have 17 ALS representatives who voted and need 19 to vote in each quorum, so two votes to go.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the poll closes when?

ARIEL LIANG: Poll closes tomorrow at [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so essentially, if two more people vote in the next day and a half, that poll will be quorate?

ARIEL LIANG: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so at this point, we probably don't have any danger of not having any ALAC members from any of the regions. I am rather disappointed at the level of voting in some of these regions, and I don't know what we can do about it, but clearly it's an indication that our regions are not

---

functioning all that well, if even voting for ALAC members is something that is treated with a fair amount of apathy. So I think it's a measure of problems we have, and I think we're going to have to keep on looking at that as we look at ALSes and as we go into the At-Large review.

Any last points before we close? We are five minutes over, but it's been an interesting meeting. Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I call this meeting to a close. Thank you all for participating, some of you at exceedingly awkward hours, and we'll see you online. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye.

YESIM NAZLAR: The meeting has been adjourned, so you now will be disconnected. Thank you very much for your participation. Have a lovely day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]