

---

GISELLA GRUBER: ...everyone noted. So if it's all good with you, we will get the recording started and officially start interpretation.

ALAN GREENBERG: [crosstalk]

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good aft – thank you, Alan. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> of July, at 21:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Kaili Kan, Sébastien Bachollet, Jimmy Schulz, León Sanchez, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Seun Ojedeji, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Yrjö Länsipuro, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, Isaac Maposa, Sarah Kiden.

On the Spanish channel, we have Aida Noblia and Alberto Soto. On the French channel, we have Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. We do not have Russian interpretation this evening.

Apologies have been noted from Harold Arcos, Sandra Hoferichter, Vanda Scartezini, Bastiaan Goslings, Tim Denton, Ron Sherwood, Hadja Sanon, Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

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

---

*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.*

---

We have French and Spanish interpretation this evening, with Claire and Camila on French and Veronica and Sabrina on Spanish.

If I could also please remind everyone to please state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channel, and that every time you speak up. And also to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

Thank you, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We have a moderately full call today, so we will probably not end early, unless things go really, really well. But are there any questions on the agenda or any other business that is known at this point?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we are assuming it is accepted as shown. And, Heidi, are there any action items out of Helsinki that need our attention at this point?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Alan, yes. I'm going to highlight three of them. The first one is on the issue of dual membership. And that is for Tijani to draft a while paper on dual membership issue for review by the ALAC. That still needs to be done.

The next item is for Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: For clarification, for those who don't recall or those who weren't in Helsinki, that's for ALSes that are part of some other part of ICANN, part of a GNSO constituency or some other affiliation. And the question is, should they be allowed? Should they be voting? Or what other issues are there that we need to consider?

Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. Yes. And the second item is for Olivier, and that is just a reminder that there was an action item on the ATLAS II implementation to have a call before – let's see – sometime in the summer to look at the draft report. And then following incorporation of comments on that draft report, that it's going to be presented to the Board in Hyderabad. So a little bit of time, but it might be useful to have a call relatively shortly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier had an X up, which either means he's refusing to do it or it's not done yet.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And then the third action item –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's not done yet.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you. And then I know last week was busy for several members of EURALO, and even staff, who participated in [a summer school].

The third one is an update on the action item for staff to arrange an At-Large briefing webinar on DNSSEC key rollover. And that will be taking place in September. And there will be a staff person that works with David Conrad, who will be giving that presentation. So that is underway.

Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Heidi. Next item is At-Large policy development. And we have a huge list of public comments that are either in some process or are brand new for the last couple of weeks. Let's see how many we can dispense of at this meeting, either by deciding what we're doing with them and who's going to do it, or deciding not to comment on it.

Ariel, I'll turn it over to you for the review.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Alan. So the one that is more or less urgent is the request for input on the rights protection mechanisms in all gTLDs. The due date is 31<sup>st</sup> of July, and that's assigned Alan. And would you like to give us some update?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: The update is it hasn't been done yet. I'm going to try to look at it. It may be something that falls by the wayside, unless anyone feels really strongly about it and is willing to also put some work into it. So I guess that's an open question. I will try to draft something, but at this point it's questionable whether I'll make it in time.

Anyone else feel strongly about this one?

Well, if anyone wants to contact me or Ariel quickly, do so offline. Next, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: I think Sébastien just raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Sébastien.

We can't hear you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, you can't, it was on mute. And it was just to comment about a topic [inaudible] by the ALAC. I was off Internet for a few days and was not able to vote. But if I would have been able, I would have vote yes. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I guess the rights protection mechanism just warrants some comment as to way I haven't done it and why I don't

---

consider it all that important. The ALAC was heavily involved – specifically, Olivier and I – when the two new rights protection mechanisms, the URS and the Trademark Clearinghouse were put in place, for the new gTLDs. We were basically supportive of both processes. We had some minor concerns with both of them, we and the community. And any comment I would make at this point would essentially remind the group of those, to look at them and get further input on them.

So it's not a major issue, and I don't think the overall PDP that's going ahead, which we'll be working on for quite some time, is going to suffer greatly if we don't put our input in at this point. It will be put in as we go forward, if not immediately. So that's why I'm not overly worried if we don't get that one done.

Ariel, back to you on the review though.

ARIEL LIANG: Alan, I see Olivier also raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, you're right. Sorry, I'm not paying attention. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And I was just going to mention, I haven't read the report or this thing in any detail. It would be good perhaps to scope it through. As you said, we had minor issues with the Trademark Clearinghouse at the beginning. This review, I'm a little concerned if we

---

were to say, “Oh, we have no problem at all,” and the review actually shows something blatantly different and basically says, “We need to change this whole thing upside down.” So maybe we should just have a quick browse at it [crosstalk].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, this, if I remember correctly, is solicitation of input at the start of the process. And I believe León is on that PDP. León, is that correct? León’s hand is up, so I’ll –

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yeah, that is correct, Alan. As you may know, I drafted the comment on the Trademark Clearinghouse review process PDP. And of course, we will be [seeding into] the process, along with the many comments that, of course, we may receive from the At-Large community. But I don’t know if Olivier has already finished his comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Okay. Well, excellent. So if I could continue, I haven’t gone through all the details in the report as well, but I did [count] through some of the numbers that are show in the different graphics. And one statistic that

---

left me with some kind of an uneasiness is the one that speaks about the applications for the Trademark Clearinghouse versus the abandoned applications. And if you look at that statistic, you will see that we have somewhere around 2 million applications for [inaudible] in the Trademark Clearinghouse. And from those almost 2 million, we have an approximate 1,800,000 applications that were abandoned in the process.

So that clearly signals to me that the Trademark Clearinghouse is not working as it should at some point. Of course, we should be diving into the reasons why the applicants abandoned their applications. But it is clear to me if we are having an average of 10% of the applications being successful, then something is wrong with the process.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I guess I'm not overly concerned. The Trademark Clearinghouse is there for two main reasons. One is to allow people who are registered to participate in sunrise and other startup processes to get domains early. And the second is to provide warnings to people who are registering a name which might be potentially conflicting with the trademark rights.

One of the concerns we had originally was those warning notices might have a chilling effect. That is, someone who was registering a name that is not in violation might, because of that notice, decide not to do it anyway. So the chilling effect was one of the concerns At-Large had.

So from a user point of view, if people are not availing themselves of the sunrise availability and are not being overly protective of their



---

trademarks, it essentially reverts back to what the situation is on the other TLDs. And I'm not sure there's a large user issue there. There's certainly a trademark issue. But I'm not sure if, from a user's perspective, it's a very large one.

But, León, perhaps we can talk offline and decide if we want to put something together quickly or not.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Excellent, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Ariel, back to you again. I allocated 15 minutes for this. It looks like it won't be sufficient unless we start making some headway. Go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. We have about 12 public comments that need decisions. So I will just go through the ones that are due soon. The first one is the ICANN Fellowship Program application process review. And that will close on July the 29<sup>th</sup>. And I think it was circulated to the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee, but I don't think anybody volunteered to draft a statement on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, this is an interesting one. There have been a number of people in At-Large who have been exceedingly vocal about problems with the

---

Fellowship Program, that it disenfranchises people from certain countries, from small island nations and, in some cases, from large countries, like Argentina, because of the change in the World Bank classifications for them.

And my recollection is that the proposal is that they're going to remove these restrictions. And if ALAC and At-Large have been complaining vehemently and we don't bother saying, "Yes, we support these changes," then I don't quite understand it. And I would really like to hear from the people who were complaining about problems in the Fellowship Program to understand why they don't think it warrants supporting these changes if indeed they will address the problems we had. So we may want to reach out explicitly to some of those people. We can identify them.

But at this point, it closes in three days. And if no one has a statement, we don't make one. If the people who were complaining don't care enough, then I'm not sure I'm going to worry an awful lot about it.

Next item, please.

ARIEL LIANG:

The next item is draft PTI Articles of Incorporation. That closes on the 31<sup>st</sup> of July. And Alberto raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alberto, is this on this item or the Fellowship?

Alberto, please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you.

INTERPRETER: The interpreter apologizes. We cannot receive Alberto Soto's audio.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Then we will continue. On the PTI Articles of Incorporation – and the same goes for a number of other PTI issues – I'll give you my position, and I'd like to hear from other people. Certainly, in my personal view, PTI was not a necessary part of the IANA transition. It is what the CWG Stewardship came up with as a compromise. It's going to end up costing us some money, but it should work fine.

I really don't think that the details of the Articles of Incorporation, or the Bylaws, or the Board composition, which have been the issues that most people have commented on, are going to make one bit of a difference. I think the organization will work and do the job properly, or it will fail. But it's not likely to fail because of those issues, and I don't think they're worthy of a lot of At-Large time to focus on fine tuning. That's certainly my personal position, but I would like to hear from other people.

We have had no volunteers for people who want to comment on any of the PTI-related issues to date. Any hands up?

---

Well, either I have bored everyone, or you agree with me. I don't know which. But, Ariel, let's go on. And let's skip the other PTI-related ones, unless someone has some specific input on them. Ariel, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks, Alan. So the next one is also an input request from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. And that one is a set of six overarching subjects the PDP working group is seeking input on. And the deadline is August the 1<sup>st</sup>, so it's pretty soon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we had any volunteers on that one? We have a number of members on the group. Holly, your hand is up. Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I haven't had a chance to get my head around it. I'm still getting over the holidays and the jetlag. I would like to have a look and get back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Come back to us within two days, please.

HOLLY RAICHE: I will try, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The next one is on Reference Label Generation Rulesets for the second level. It closes on August the 1<sup>st</sup>.

ALAN GREENBERG: Another one that's been open for a month that we haven't had any large amount of interest in. Do I hear anyone from... IDN is certainly of great interest to this group, but LGRs have not been of great interest. LGRs are the details associated, language-by-language, for how the names are essentially parsed and treated.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Has the IDN Working Group been asked a question about it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I haven't explicitly. Ariel, has anything gone to them?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, when the public comment opened, I sent this to the IDN Working Group as well [crosstalk].

ALAN GREENBERG: And we got no response?

---

ARIEL LIANG: No response.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks, Alan. So if I may say, really, it's down to the Chair of the IDN Working Group to come back. I can't imagine people on the ALAC, who have – well, most of us, I think, have no in-depth knowledge of IDN. I can't imagine any of us being able to rule on whether we do need something or not. But we have people, supposedly competent, on our IDN Working Group, and this is where the discussion should be, hopefully. If the Chair is not doing anything, then maybe we have to find another Chair for the IDN Working Group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, you do recall, the IDN Working Group is one that we hypothesized we should shut down as a working group, as such, although we need one or two point people. But it wasn't clear we need a working group, as such. That was one of the discussions we have never finalized.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, well, if I may say, then I guess we can just forget about IDNs. We had an IDN liaison a few years ago. Then it turned into a working group, and now it has seems to have withered. So if there is no knowledge or

---

understanding of IDNs in At-Large, I think we probably wouldn't be able to comment on anything.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I think IDN is business as usual at this point. I'm not sure it's something that require – other than the implementations on a language-by-language basis, and in general we are not the experts on every language – the general rules are that it's business as usual. This particular one is looking at IDN rulesets at the second level. I don't believe it's actually creating the rulesets, but is looking for overall policy.

But at this point, we do have a speaker list. Let me to go Cheryl and then Holly. And if there's any compelling reason that we want to keep this one open, then we will.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. And, Olivier, I think you're overreacting just a little bit on this particular issue and, perhaps to a lesser extent, on the whole IDN Working Group matter. As Alan has articulated, this is the Label Generation Rule [inaudible] and a very small subset of specific interest for even those of us quite passionate about Internationalized Domain Names, and at the second level to boot. So I would suggest that, as a no longer current member of the IDN Working Group but as a founding member of it, I would not suggest that we worry ourselves about this at all. It is possibly why the IDN Working Group did not worry about

---

getting back to Ariel, although a courtesy, “No, we don’t need to,” would probably be a good thing.

And, yes, to a great extent, as Alan said, the wonderful world of Internationalized Domain Names is kind of trickling along now as business as usual, and we can probably downplay our requirement for an active workgroup. And I’m relatively comfortable that we could, if need be, resuscitate at least a small nucleus of it [inaudible] skill sets and experience. And mine, of course, don’t come from any other language based, but rather as an advocate for it in principle. So if need be, we could come to the fore. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Just to reiterate what this particular public comment is about, rulesets have been created for about 30 different languages. The rulesets were created for use at the top level. This is hypothesizing that they could not be used at the second level, if any given registry chooses to implement a specific language at the second level, and that they would presumably use the same rulesets as were developed at the top level. I don’t think it’s a particularly controversial thing, but I’m certainly not the expert in it.

Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a suggestion. Why don’t we actually contact Edmon directly and say, “Look, is this worthy of a comment or not?” He’s in the thick of it. He’s running the whole thing. So I think that’s the best place to go.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Edmon and Satish, as co-Chairs, I believe were the ones that were contacted by Ariel. We could ask them again, pointing out that the comment is closing soon.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that's a good suggestion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, why don't you do that? One last gasp.  
Next item, please?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The next one is on the proposed amendments to .com registry agreement. It closes on 12<sup>th</sup> of August.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. This is an interesting one. I haven't looked at it in detail. The history is that Verisign is being... There is an agreement with Verisign that will be signed to have them continue as the root zone publisher, going forward. There, the statement that was made, or the background, is that the code to implement publishing of the root zone and the security and the code for security around .com are heavily intertwined. Essentially, the same infrastructure is used for both. And they wanted a level of comfort that the two contracts would be in sync and they would not be asked to disable half of the security mechanisms associated with

---

.com if, for instance, the root zone publication contract went somewhere else.

So my understanding, but I haven't looked at the actual documents, is that this is to put the two contracts in sync, because otherwise they would end up with a business situation for their .com registry which was untenable. There has been concern raised, however, that these two things should not be linked. Conceptually, they should be quite different. But apparently, the reality of the physical infrastructure and code is that they are tightly coupled.

Comments? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. Alan, you are speaking about the root zone publisher. I was speaking about root zone maintainers. Olivier, is there any other contract proposition?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's the publisher, which is what Verisign does right now. They do more than publish. They do some assuaging and various things. But it's the function that Verisign plays in relation to the root zone, which is tightly coupled internally with the security measures that are associated with .com and .net.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

So it is indeed the root zone maintainer contract?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, this contract is the .com registry agreement.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, publisher and maintainer is different. I ask a question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not quite – the root zone maintain – I don't remember what term is used for Verisign. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I will tell you about the root zone maintainer. The root zone maintainer is a contract between Verisign and NTIA [here] today. And it will be conferred to ICANN soon. They are working on. So you say that it is coupled with .com registry. I don't think so, because the .com registry is with ICANN, and the root zone maintainer is with NTIA.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My recollection, not having read these documents, is that the implementation of much of the root zone maintainer function is closely coupled with the implementation of .com security measures, the signing of .com and a number of other measures, including security penetration and security monitoring. And therefore – I'm giving you what I understood, which may or may not be incorrect. And therefore, Verisign wanted to the two contracts to be synchronized, in terms of timing, so they would not be in a position of losing one without the other. That's

---

my understanding. I'm ready to admit I'm wrong, if someone else has a better understanding of it.

In any case, that one goes 'til August 12<sup>th</sup>, if anyone would like to look into it. I'd like a volunteer.

No one on this call? We'll keep the call open for volunteers in the near future.

Ariel, next.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. The next one is on the proposed measure for letter/letter two-character ASCII labels to avoid confusion with corresponding country codes. It closes on 17<sup>th</sup> of August.

ALAN GREENBERG:

This is an area which has had some interest, in terms of consumer confusion. Is there anyone who would like to take this one up?

Does anyone know anyone who might want to take this one up? Can we have a volunteer for someone will at least look at the documents and make a recommendation to us?

Garth says he volunteers. Thank you, Garth. And Jimmy has his hand up.

JIMMY SCHULZ:

I would have volunteered too, but I was too late.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, no, no, you can work with... History has proven that having two people read something over is likely a better option than one. So I will take your volunteering. And if you and Garth can independently or together report back to ALAC.

JIMMY SCHULZ: I'm going to do that with Garth together.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Delighted to hear it.  
Next, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. Next one is a release of country and territory names within the .softbank, .art, and .caravan TLDs. And I think, based on the history, we don't – yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct.

ARIEL LIANG: And Cheryl raised her hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just going to say we don't need to say anything [inaudible] we've decided [inaudible] this time.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a long history of not responding on those. I see no reason to change it now, unless someone is dying to write a comment on it, but I don't see any volunteers.

Ariel, next?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The next is proposed guidelines for the second string similarity review process.

ALAN GREENBERG: That one, if I remember correctly –

ARIEL LIANG: And it ends on August the 31<sup>st</sup>.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that one is string similarity related to IDN TLDs for country codes, if I remember correctly on it. Again, string similarity is something which concerns At-Large, if anyone would like to take a further look at that.

---

Maureen, am I correct? Is Maureen – no, Maureen is not on our call today, correct? Maureen is on our call. Okay, I wasn't sure if she was going to make it or not.

Maureen, is this indeed related to country codes? Do I remember correctly?

She would say so. Apparently, Maureen can't speak. Maureen, if I could ask you to take a quick look at it. My recollection is this is a refinement, or a potential refinement, of the rules that were used for string similarity on the first go-round of IDN country codes. And this is a review of it, to see whether anything needs to be changed. If you could take a quick look at it and report back to us, I would appreciate that.

Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. The next one is on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index beta, closes on September the 6<sup>th</sup>.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That one, again, I would think is of great interest to us. Anything related to gTLDs has had something that we have been concerned about. Do we have any volunteers, if someone would like to take a look at that and see if it's something that's of interest to us?

No volunteers? Well, let's put out a notice. Ariel, have we sent out an alert on that one yet?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I think there was ALAC announcement, At-Large list, and also the New gTLD Working Group list. And I just want to remind you that Olivier drafted a statement [refer] to this public comment. It's a previous public comment on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index. So maybe he will be able to review this one too. That's my suggestion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier has his hands full. All right. Let's send out another note, reminding people about Olivier's previous comment pointing to it, see if we get anyone to bite.

ARIEL LIANG: Do you want me to send this to the ALAC work list? Or which list [crosstalk]?

ALAN GREENBERG: ALAC and gTLD list.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything on policy issues? I think we're now completed.



---

ARIEL LIANG: That's all for public comments. And I think Garth is going to draft something related to creating a consumer agenda at ICANN. I created a workspace for this, but any feedback on that, I'm wondering whether Garth has any input on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see Olivier's hand and Garth. Go ahead.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Just on the last point that you've made here, the gTLD Marketplace Health Index, that report has a significant number of portions on consumer trust, on competition. It's all about consumer competition and saying... It's basically a set of indicators that would show these things, making it look good and so on.

I think that this has somehow to do also with registrant, or registration issues working group. Whoever is following up on our consumer trust issues. And I think that was registrant issues. I suggest that these people would also be asked this. And certainly, I can think of a couple of ALAC who would be right around the right sort of person to read this and to comment on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, that group should be sent to, Ariel.

Garth, go ahead.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. So on this agenda, I had previously sent out a list of items. And I have another item that I would like to add to that. And this may specifically go into the area that Olivier is talking about. So we want to make this a broad, consumer-focused agenda. So I will add to the space that Ariel created. I haven't had a chance to yet. And I'll put, so far, what I have written into that space. And I want to make sure we get as many comments as possible, and I want to make sure this agenda reaches all of the broad consumer needs out there. So if anybody has any ideas that they want to add to the agenda to augment it, I want to hear them all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you, Garth. I'm afraid I haven't had a chance to even look at your document yet.

GARTH BRUEN: It's hardly a document.

ALAN GREENBERG: Pardon me?

GARTH BRUEN: It's hardly a document yet.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, sorry. I wasn't trying to enhance it. What you sent out. But I certainly intend to. And why don't we put a deadline on it? We're at the end of July now. Let's schedule a call for near the end of August to discuss it. I won't call it a webinar to present it, but for any people who are interested in consumer issues, let's put a deadline of having comments, let's say a call about a month from now, and comments are due on the wiki three weeks from now, a week or so before that, so we have something to talk about.

Garth, does that sound like something that would be practical? We're not really good about responding by e-mail and on wikis. And I think if we schedule a call, it may be worthwhile in getting people to actually contribute in that form.

GARTH BRUEN:

Yeah, absolutely. And I think if people on this call don't have some consumer concerns, I think they're probably on the wrong call. Everybody here has consumer issues. What are your consumer issues? And I'm actually, in order to add on to this way of nudging it along, I'll ask people directly. I will ask everybody in ALAC and all of the regional officers directly, "What are you concerned about? What should be on this agenda?" So we can move it along. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And, Heidi, you had a comment regarding the Public Interest Working Group?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you, Alan. As I noted in the chat, during today's EURALO call, it was mentioned that perhaps the At-Large working group on the public interest should take a look at that. That was supported by Wolf and Jean-Jacques. So the next call of that group is being scheduled for mid-August, and Garth's current document is going to be reviewed during that. So I think a call of the ALAC, a special call after that call, would be useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, it might be useful to try to make sure that Garth can attend that call, that public interest call.

GARTH BRUEN: Heidi, what was the date on that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We'll [inaudible]. It's still being scheduled.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's being scheduled, but I suspect he's not on the mailing list. So make sure he is copied on the Doodle.

Olivier, your hand is up.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And one of the feedbacks that we had on the EURALO call earlier, specifically from Jean-Jacques Subrenat, was a question regarding this consumer thing and saying why consumer and why not user? Why not go for a user agenda? And I was just going to ask the question here. No need to elaborate on it too much, but that will probably be one of the questions. I certainly have told Jean-Jacques to get in touch with you directly, Garth.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think at least part of the answer is Garth wrote it and wrote what he thinks. If other people think it's wrong, then we need to have that conversation. "Wrong" is perhaps the wrong word. If the emphasis should be differently, that's why we're asking for people to contribute. So I would welcome thoughts from Jean-Jacques on why the words should be changed.

Garth, go ahead.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Olivier. I think that's an important point. In general – and this is my personal opinion – I think that users are easily dismissed as a population. "Consumer" implies that you are in some sort of financial relationship with other parties. And I think for most people on the Internet, this is true. You're paying for Internet service. You are buying products on the Internet. And specifically for a certain population, they're buying domain names. And people who use domain names, even just through their posting of blogs, etc., etc., they're fueling advertising revenue, which generates revenue for domain holders. And

---

when you put people in a position where they're saying, "I'm not just a user. I am a consumer. I am somebody who is contributing financially to this structure. I have a stake in it, and I can't be ignored." And that's why I use the word "consumer" instead of "user."

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. I'm going to call an end to this particular item. We're way, way over time at this point. But this is exactly the kind of discussion we need to be having on the e-mail, on the wiki, and in the future call.

I think it's a truth that all of us get very upset when things are not working properly. And I think we have to take it upon ourselves to put out there what we want to see. And I think Garth for taking the initiative, and I think we have to follow up and work on this.

Next item. We are now 45 minutes into the call and about 30 minutes over time. Review of ALS applications. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you. I will be very brief, just highlight some key points. Total number of ALSes, current at 201. We have a couple of AFRALO At-Large Structures that we have regional advice being waited for. There is an issue there which we're going to speak – Alan, I think you're going to speak to some of the members of AFRALO on that. And we are currently processing due diligence for ISOC El Salvador. And I think that is it, very briefly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I see Judith has her hand up. Please, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: My question is, as Glenn and I were looking at them, there's a new due diligence form that's out. It seems to be a revised version from ones that we used to have. And I'm wondering, in the past, the other form had private information that, when we send out for regional advice, we wouldn't send out to all ALSes. And can this new form be sent out in combination with the application so people have a clearer view of the application? Because on the due diligence, there are some questions that [Natalie] had asked and got answered that are not in the application. And I know we can't change the application yet in this format. So I was just curious about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi or Silvia, do you have any answer on that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Judith, I'm not aware of any new questions on due diligence. I'm asking [Natalie], so I'm hoping to have an answer very shortly for you on that. And I'll send it to you via the list. Okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: I know she sent something out as a draft. I didn't think it was anything that was in place at this point.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: All I know is that this form looked different than the past ones we have gotten. Maybe the new formatting, maybe something else, but it looked totally different.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Heidi, if you can look into it, and we'll get back.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I understand [inaudible] replying. I don't think it looks totally different, but...

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's not have a debate on it now.

Item number 6, reports. Does anyone – these are reports from working groups, RALOs, liaisons. Anyone have anything they want to raise that needs the focus of the group?

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I was just going to mention one thing on the recent GNSO Council call. That was the just appointment of James Gannon as CSC liaison to the GNSO. As you know, the ALAC has appointed Mohamed El Bashir. So these are all names that we know,



---

and it's very good people on this committee, the Customer Standing Committee, of course, as we know, in the IANA stewardship transition.

That's all. The rest, I'll submit in writing. I have not written the text yet, but it will appear later on this week. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Any other comments?

Nothing? Olivier, I presume that's an old hand. Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry, I was trying to find the unmute. Yes, just to let you know, as Olivier mentioned, the SSAC has appointed Jeff Bedser to the Customer Standing Committee. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, the SSAC has appointed?

JULIE HAMMER: Jeff Bedser, who's one of our experienced SSAC members. He's going on the Customer Standing Committee.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just missed the name. And, Maureen?

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not very loud, but we can hear you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just an update on Ron Sherwood, actually. I did [inaudible] talking to [inaudible] and she said the Ron has actually [inaudible]. He's obviously not [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Maureen faded out. I didn't hear what she said after her introduction. Did anyone else hear it? Or Maureen can say it again.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'm sorry about that. I'm in a hotel, so I'm not quite sure how good their system. Ron Sherwood is stepping down from his liaison role. So [inaudible] replacement.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, he's stepping down from the liaison role. Do we have any input on his health?

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, no. She only just received notification this morning. So she'll get back to us. I don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much. Any other reports before we –

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry to interrupt. I'm just confirming the interpreter actually wasn't even able to interpret what Maureen was saying, in which case the other language channels would only have heard [inaudible]. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe the substance was that Ron is stepping down from his liaison report. And when we get input on his health, we'll let the group know on the ALAC internal list.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just as an update, I had received a post-Helsinki from Ron and [Luja]. And they certainly appreciate all the good wishes. He's home, but he has a long road ahead of him for recovery. And so it makes good sense that he will be focusing on that and not on our demands within ICANN. But I don't think it will be the last we see or hear of Ron. And once his health has resumed, I'm sure we'll see back at ICANN meetings and, who knows, perhaps back with us at some point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Good to hear. I know we all wish him well.

---

Next item, if we have no more reports, is the ALAC Rules of Procedure. You'll recall that in Helsinki we approved the rules associated with a Director appointment, with one minor correction that needs to be made, because there was one omission. There were other changes that were made to the Rules of Procedure that we never had an opportunity to review. They will be going up to the ALAC for a decision in the near future, and I'd like to take the opportunity right now of going over them.

Gisella, if I can ask you to scroll as we can go through them, I'll tell you where we need to go.

There's another document that is linked in the agenda that is essential a description of the changes. And we can't display two of them at once, but I will try to review what they are. The changes come in a number of different categories. The majority of the changes are corrections. They are things that were found to be in error or otherwise wrong in the original rules of procedure. There are one or two things that were omissions that were left out inadvertently, and one clarification.

Let me go over the ones that are the simple ones first, and then we will take the ones that are more substantive later. The first two are in sections 2 and 3.1.2 – and we don't need to scroll to them – and 14.4.1. They are simply URLs that were replaced. They are URLs where ICANN has reorganized their website, and the current ones, although they still resolve, are not the correct ones. So this just corrects them.

The next one, which is a correction, is on 11.4.3, if we could scroll to that, please.

---

And we just passed by. Go backwards.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That one previously read, “For a consensus decision to be considered valid, the meeting must be quorate.” Many of our consensus calls are electronic, and electronic decisions are always deemed to be quorate. And there is a section later in the rules that talk about that. So this just clarifies that when we’re talking about it must be quorate, we’re talking about consensus decisions in the meeting.

Next one is 11.8.4, if we could scroll to that, please. Now, what this said is – this is on procedural motions. 11.8.3 says that the Chair may disallow a motion if he or she feels that the question had not been fully explored. This is a motion to stop debate, something that we never actually do in practice, but we could. 11.8.4 said that once a motion is made, it must be decided by consensus or a vote. That makes no sense, if the Chair has ruled it out of order. So this change just simply says that we only need to make a decision if the rule stands.

Next item for correction is 12.3.10. And that is a new section that says – the whole Section 12.3 talks about proxies. And it was talking about votes. They also apply for consensus decisions. And this simply says that if any references to vote also apply to consensus.

Next one that is a clarification is 16.3. All right, thank you. We have always had a practice in At-Large that if there is only one candidate, that

---

candidate is acclaimed as the winner. That practice, as I said, has always been in place and has always been used without any question.

Recently, in a number of RALOs, there were instances where it was unclear what the process should be following a sole candidate. And this simply codifies our existing practice. That is, if there is only one candidate, that candidate is deemed to be the winner. At the time that the rules were written, I don't think anyone considered it needed to be said. But at this point, just to be prudent, it was felt that we should add it.

And the last correction is a correction, in fact, to the changes we made in Helsinki. And that's 19.11.6.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Alan, my electronic clock just told me what the time was. Could you please repeat which number we're again scrolling to?

ALAN GREENBERG: 19.11.6.

GISELLA GRUBER: Much appreciated. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we're getting close. There we are. This is the rule saying what kind of random selection do we use. And the selection is used at three different places: if there's no time for a runoff election, if there's no

---

time to redo a tied election when there are only two, or if the second vote is taken and also resorts in a tie. So those are three conditions under which random selection might be used. The text only referred to the first two. And therefore, this just puts in the third – sorry – the third reason that a random selection might need to be taken.

Is there any comments on any of these changes? I believe they are all corrections, clarifications. They do not change anything in any substance. Is there any concern that any of these will raise a concern when we come to present them to the ALAC for a vote?

Judith, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So I posted my question in the chat. This says if there's no time for a runoff election or a third thing. But what about in the cases where there is time? Do we still do the third vote or something like that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, there's no third vote. The rules only allow for one second vote. If that second vote results in a tie again, then we revert to random at that point.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. But what about it says if there's no time to have a runoff election. So that indicates we didn't have a second vote yet?



---

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. If there is a tie, that we would attempt to use either a runoff or redoing the election, depending on whether we're looking at the... If there were three people and there was a tie for last, then we'd do a runoff between the two candidates, those two who were tied. If there was –

SEUN OJEDEJI: [crosstalk] in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we'll put you in the queue, Seun.

If we're looking at the last vote between two candidates, then that one, we simply redo that whole election over again, in both cases, if the BMSPC deems that there is sufficient time to do that. If there is no time, then a random selection would be used. Obviously, in all cases, we are going to do our best to avoid random selections. But that is what the rules allow. Does that answer the question, Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. I guess I get it. There's also no... It's not like you can win by one vote and that would be still a choice.

ALAN GREENBERG: A majority is a majority. All you need is a majority in this election. Again, whether it should be a majority or super-majority to win is a good

---

question. And someday, we may look at the overall process again. But at this point, we're just trying to make sure that the rules are clear.

Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I think you basically answered my question in your response to Judith. I just wanted to [inaudible] means whether there is no time or there is time or whether there is time. But you just clarified that with the answers.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's a decision of the BMSPC, through the BMSPC Chair.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The BMSPC has the responsibility for running all aspects of the selection that are not specifically given to the ALAC or to the BCEC. So other than that, that group is effectively autonomous.

Judith, is that a new hand? No, okay. All right. Let's now go on to the items which have a little bit more substance to them. I don't believe they change anything in fact, but they have – various people have expressed some concern.

---

The first one is sections 3.5.4 up to 3.5.6, if we could scroll back to them, please, right near the beginning. Getting close. There we are. All right.

What this does is simply codifies what is the current practice. The ALT, the ALAC Leadership Team, is officially the five regionally balanced representatives of each of the RALOs. In practice, most ALT discussions also include the liaisons to the other ICANN ACs and SOs.

Somebody needs to mute their microphone.

And my practice has been, I have included the two past Chairs, at my discretion, in these discussions. There is sometimes some confusion when we talk about the ALT, whether in fact we are talking about the ALT, just the five members, or the larger ALT, when tend to participate in most meetings. And this simply introduces some terminology to make it clear that we have different terms to talk about the ALT and the superset of the ALT, which are often involved in meetings. And I've chosen to use the term "advisors to the ALT." There's nothing magic about that. That was just trying to find some terminology that would be moderately clear.

So these three sections do not change anything in fact, but they do codify it so that we can use terminology that is clearer, when necessary. Are there any comments, concerns, or input on this one?

Give people a chance to raise their hands [inaudible]. We have two, Sébastien and Tijani. Sébastien, please go ahead.

If you're speaking, we can't hear you.

---

Tijani, go ahead. Sebastien said you should go first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I think that this communication that you call communication is limiting our, let's say, make restrictions for the Chair to have advisors. I don't think advisors should be only former Chair. We may have other advisors. The Chair can ask for other advisors to participate in the ALT meetings. I prefer, let the Chair free to choose who he may call for advisors on the ALT, other than making only the former Chair be possible advisors for the ALT. I think that we may have also the expertise of the former members of the Board, for example. So let the Chair, at his discretion, get the advisors that he wants, that he feels the ALT will need their advice. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Just for clarification, the 3.5.5 – or nothing there restricts the advisors to that list. But I think you're suggesting that 3.5.5 simply be a statement saying that ALAC Chair, at the discretion of the Chair, may include other advisors to participate in ALT meetings. Is that correct? And not explicitly cite the past Chairs.

Tijani, is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No. No, Alan. My point is not to formalize any kind of advisor for the ALT. It must be at the discretion of the Chair when he needs or when he feels that the ALT will need their advice. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you suggesting that we put that into the rules, or have the rules silent on it completely?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I prefer the actual situation, but not say anything in the rules about advisors.

ALAN GREENBERG: But that implies that we still have the confusion of not knowing how to refer to this superset ALT. I can live with that. I'd just like to hear from other people.

Sébastien, do you want to speak now?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Alan. Can you hear me well?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you very much. I'm sorry for the delay. Yeah, I have trouble with this. First of all, I think there is too much in those rules, discussion of the Chair, whoever is the Chair, was the Chair, will be the Chair. I think we are a collective organization, and we need to find a way to have something done collectively and not to have too much power to

---

the Chair. And I think not just the Chair of ALAC, but the Chair of even the Board. I think it's too heavy.

If we write something about the Chair being the choice of adding advisor, then we need to add the other member of the ALT or the ALAC to decide to have the possibility to add. Not alone; maybe half of them or three-quarter of them, or whatever, have the possibility also. And it seems to be that you are trying to find words. But if it's an advisor, it's not advisor for all the time of the Chair, for one year for example. It's not too different [inaudible] completely the ALAC in doing so. ALT, it's five people, full stop. ALAC is 15 people, plus liaison, plus a Chair, and so on. And that's okay.

But if we have not any more in the original balance in the superset of ALT, then I really think we need to think about that and try to find less [inaudible] solution and not to add too much people to one group. We have an ALT, and this must not be doubled by all type of advisor. If it could be that at some meetings with specific participation, and that's another situation. And when it's become a day-to-day job [work] organization, it's not anymore the same organization that we decide these five people at the beginning. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just for the record, the reason I was doing this is to make it clear that when the ALT makes decisions, it is the ALT, the five people, period. If anyone has any suggestions on a word to use other than "advisors," I have no problem with that. That's just the word I came up with, if you're not comfortable with it. But as I said, this is describing

---

what really happens. And I for one, as Chair, I do not believe it would be workable if we said the liaisons to the ACs and SOs do not participate in these discussions. They are key participants in these discussions. They may not make decisions as part of the ALT, but they are key parts of the discussions. So certainly, it will be untenable not to have them. I feel similarly about the past Chairs, to the extent they're willing to participate.

Jimmy, go ahead.

JIMMY SCHULZ:

To Tijani, with 3.5.6, it says there are additional advisors, except – additional to the past Chairs. So my question to 3.5.6 is are normally invited to participate in all [out] meetings? Who's inviting, and who can that be? Who are these advisors?

ALAN GREENBERG:

They are the ones that are identified in 3.5.4 and 3.5.5, the liaisons. And at my discretion, I have included the two most recent past Chairs. 3.5.6 is reiterating that decisions are made by the ALT, not by those other people.

JIMMY SCHULZ:

Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani, go ahead.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, we'll put you in the queue. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I want to remind you that the ALT meeting, as all the meeting on At-Large, are open for everyone. And everyone can participate and discuss. So the liaison should be – should be, no – are participating on the ALT meetings, and they are welcome. I think this is the right decision. We don't have to make any formalization. I think they are liaison. And we can add in the rules that the liaison should, or will, participate in the ALT meetings without a decision of power. This is something that we can add.

But adding other things, such as advisors, I am very fine with the two people, the former Chairs that are now participating with us in the ALT. That is very good. But it is because they are Cheryl and Olivier. If they are other X and Y, perhaps I would not be very happy with that, even if the Chair wants them to be on the ALT.

So I think this is... If we formalize it, it would be more binding, which is something which is on the rules. So will be obliged to accept anyone that the Chair decides to add to the ALT. I think that we need to let the discussion of the Chair with the acceptance of all the ALT members, for sure, and not formalize any function or any kind of people that has to be as advisors for the ALT. Thank you.



ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. For the record, it is already in our rules that the liaisons are supposed to participate in the ALT meetings. We don't need to add that.

Seun, if you could speak, please. We are really running out of time, and this is a much longer discussion. At this point, we have had two people express their concern with this addition. We have not heard from anyone else. We will be putting it to the mailing list.

Please, Seun, go ahead, and then we'll go on to the next item.

SEUN OJEDEJI: So for the record, I will [agree]. So I will follow up on the mailing list. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If you could, when you do, please give your rationale. Thank you.

Next item. 11.6.3, please. If we could scroll to 11.6.3? I think we passed it. Thank you very much.

Our current rules say that every motion, including consensus calls, must be seconded. In practice, we routinely do not bother. Certainly from my point of view, I forget. Other people have done similar things in the past. I don't believe we have ever had a motion where we couldn't get a second if we asked for it. And this change says that motions do not need

---

to be seconded. However, there is a potential for an ALAC member making a motion where they are the only person who wants it, and therefore taking up significant time for the ALAC. And that is covered by saying that should any ALAC member want to second, that they can request that a second be request, and then a second is required for that motion.

This essentially says that all of our motions that are made without seconds are valid, as long as no one says a second is required. That makes sure that an individual ALAC member cannot essentially dominate the ALAC and force an issue to be discussed and voted if there is no other interest. And at the same time, it allows all of our regular business to go ahead unimpeded.

So I don't feel very strongly about it, but it does legitimize what we have been doing in fact. And I think this streamlines the process. We have a tick mark from Jimmy. Any other comments or thoughts on this one?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, there is a small change in 11.6.6.1, which simply goes ahead. We're already there. We didn't need to scroll, but now we need to scroll a little bit down. Thank you.

That one simply says that... It adds "if applicable" for seconds, because all seconds in general are not required. Seconds are still required if we have a consent agenda, and that is covered in a separate part. We so far have never had a consent agenda. But should we have one, a second is required on that one.

And that's it. So what I'm hearing is that everything is okay, with the possible exception of the delineation of the ALT and advisors. And I

---

would welcome, for whom “advisor” is a bad term, if there is some other terminology, I’ll open it to the list and we can have a discussion on that. We’ll have a discussion before the 21-day period starts so we can put out hopefully what can be approved. And we should be able to approve it at our August meeting, or soon after.

I have Sébastien and then Olivier.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Did you get through the 16.3?

ALAN GREENBERG: I’m sorry?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: 16.3?

ALAN GREENBERG: 16.3, oh, yeah, that’s the acclamation. We covered that earlier.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Because, I am sorry, I didn’t follow that. But I guess that’s, from my point, in contradiction with 17.2.1.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I don’t know what 17.2.1 is, but let me see.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: “The winning candidate must receive votes from a majority of the sitting ALAC Members.” Votes. That means like acclamation, not...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So you’re saying if we allow acclamation, we have to make sure that there isn’t a conflicting rule somewhere else. You said that was 17.1.3?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, 17.2.1.

ALAN GREENBERG: 2.1. I’ll make sure that that is not a conflict. Thank you for pointing that out.  
  
Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And I just wanted to find out what your next steps were, once these are agreed. Are you going to get ask for a vote of the ALAC to change the procedures? The reason for my question being that in parallel, on the GNSO Council at the moment, they have put together a working group to revisit their Rules of Procedures when it comes down to all the new community powers that have now been given to the GNSO Council. And it might be also a good time to start

---

such a process on the ALAC, since the ALAC will also be provided with a set of new community powers.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, that was discussed in Helsinki briefly. And the purpose we're trying to get these out of the way is so we have a clean slate, so the changes that we have to put in place for the empowered community are indeed just the changes, that we're not messing them up with other corrections and things like that. But, yes, that does have to be done. It has to be done, effectively, prior to the end of September. And that's an issue that will be starting pretty soon.

That was discussed briefly, and there was a discussion on that. You'll remember, we brought in, I think, Samantha Eisner, and someone else was there, to discuss about the changes that we would have to make to support the empowered community. You might have been at the GNSO meeting, but there was a session on that in Helsinki.

Anything else on this? The next steps, in terms of this, will be I will send these documents out with some comments, identify the issue that has been raised by Tijani and Sébastien and Seun, and we'll go forward with that. Thank you very much.

Next item on our agenda is the BCEC and the BMSPC. As you recall, in Helsinki we had a discussion saying we need to start the processes very soon. I am delighted to report that I have asked, or suggested, that Tijani be the BMSPC Chair again, as he was in the last selection. And I would like to ask people confidentially if they have any problem with that, to speak to me. But going forward, I would like to recommend to

---

the ALAC that we confirm Tijani as BMSPC Chair. I think he did a fine job last time, and would be delighted if we can have someone do it again, as it's a detailed procedure. It has a steep learning curve, and I'm happy to have Tijani do it again, a second time.

On the Chair of the BCEC, there are discussions going on. And I'm not in a position to make any recommendation at this point. But you'll be hearing soon from that.

Next item, IANA transition and accountability. As you all know, we have selected the ALAC liaison to the CSC. That's Mohamed El Bashir. When we put out the call for candidates, I really didn't know if we would get any candidates, and if we would get any candidates who were qualified. And I must admit, I didn't go through a list of everyone in At-Large or anyone who might apply. But in the end, Mohamed did apply. He has a vast background associated with ccTLDs. That is the Internet Society Sudan runs the Sudan TLD, and he is one of the originators of the Internet Society Sudan. He was the point person involved in the redelegation of it about 15 years ago. He has been a member of the ccNSO. And as one minor little point, he was Vice Chair of the ICG and so has a pretty intimate knowledge of what IANA does and what they should be doing. So I'm delighted to report that he was recommended by the Selection Committee, and the ALAC has confirmed him. And I offer my congratulations to him, as I presume you all do.

Next item, implementation progress. For those who are following any of the groups, there is an absolutely unbelievable amount of work that is going on behind the scenes to put all the bits and pieces in place for the transition. We're doing this, of course, with the presumption or hope

---

that the US Government will indeed go ahead with the transition. As many of you are aware, there's lots going on in the US, in terms of politics. The Republican National Committee formally said it is against their policy to do that. So how this will play out is not at all clear. But certainly, there is an immense amount of work going on to put all these things in place.

The last thing that we want to discuss on this item is the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2. There are a bunch of topics, and we're still looking for new people. What I did is I extracted the membership lists – memberships and participants – and asked At-Large staff to do a quick review of it and identify the At-Large people. And what we're going to see – and we're not going to go over it in detail. And I apologize ahead of time. There may be At-Large people who are not identified as At-Large in this list. But if you can give everyone scrolling capability, you can scroll it. It's attached to the agenda, so you can download it.

So you can see, we have a fair number of people. Now, recognize that just because someone puts their name, it doesn't mean they do any work. It doesn't mean they attend any meetings. So there's no guarantees. But presumably, if anyone has signed up as a member, as an active participant, then they plan to do some work. And there's a fair number of observers as well. That is, people who say they want to see the mailing list but are not necessarily planning to participate in the meetings.

So if you scroll through it, you'll see diversity, pretty good turnout. The guidelines for good, safe conduct, this is the... This is one I thought my name was in, but I don't see it there. I'm not sure what happened to it.

---

This is the one looking at rules for how one might engage in dismissal of a Board member and how one determines that people are acting in good faith. You may recall that if you are acting in good faith and you are indemnified and can't be sued, or if you're sued, ICANN will cover the costs. If you're not acting in good faith, you may be liable. So it was deemed to be reasonable to put together some rules. And this is the list for that one, good faith.

Human rights, we have a fair number of people who say they are interested in this. A long list.

IRP phase 2, we have two people who are active in that. That's not one of the Work Stream 2 topics, but it's a function that's going on in parallel right now.

Jurisdiction. Where is ICANN headquartered? Where is it incorporated? What jurisdiction does it use in its contracts? We have a fair number of people who are involved in that.

Ombudsman, we're about a third of the group. That's quite impressive.

Reviewing the CEP, I don't even remember what the CEP is. Can anyone help me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

The engagement process, which is a pre-IRC process to see whether or not you can get resolution without going to litigation.



---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I knew somebody would know what it is.

SO/AC accountability, this is a good one. SO/AC accountability, that's on page 10 of the document, is essentially saying it's fine to turn ICANN over to the ACs and SOs, because we trust them more than the Board. But how do we know we trust the ACs and SOs? And it's a really good question. And hopefully, we've got a pretty good participation in that one, but more people are welcome.

Staff accountability, we're a good part of that one.

Transparency of ICANN, interesting participation.

In any case, if any of these topics strike your fancy, you can still join. If you're not sure, you can be an observer and then switch to be an active participant later. These groups will be doing the basic work that will then make recommendations to the CCWG. So this is the opportunity to get involved. It's in small chunks. It's not nearly as major commitment as the original CCWG was. So pick a subject that you find interesting. If you have other people in your At-Large communities, within your RALOs, that you think might have an interest, wake them up and say they should join. This is a good way to get involved in working groups on specific subjects that will then serve you well to get more involved in other things and address some of the overall engagement problems that we know we have that we talked about earlier.

John Laprise says, "Pencil me in for human rights." If staff can send him the right e-mail address. It used to be there was a Google Docs to sign up, but they have now been migrated over to the wiki. So I'm assuming that a message to staff will do it.

---

Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, just to say that the people who are interested with Work Stream 2, to have a little bit more information, Tijani organized a webinar. And Cheryl and myself gives a talk. And it could be also a good way to get some information. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And if anyone notices At-Large people who were not highlighted, then please let us know. And if you notice someone highlighted that isn't At-Large, let us know.

All right, next item on our agenda is At-Large review. And I turn it over to Cheryl and Holly, or Holly and Cheryl according to the agenda. I note that we are an hour and 35 minutes in to the call. And according to the agenda, we should have been at one hour. So we are running 35 minutes late. Anything you can do to make sure that you get your information out, but keep it concise, would be appreciated.

Who is taking lead, Holly or Cheryl?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm happy to start and point out Tom Mackenzie sent out a very useful and excellent summary of where they are up to. I wish everybody would read it. Just a couple of lines from what he said, which is they are into the survey. They have done a lot of interviews, including about 60 interviews, 20 additional interviews mixed in conversations bring it up

---

to about 80. They will provide the working party with a more precise number of interviews and breakdowns during the upcoming call, which is within 24 hours. As they said, it's still [early days] to draw conclusions. They've started to see issues emerging, which will come out of the results of the online survey.

And I don't think there's anything else that need be said, except to thank Tom for updating everyone. And there is a meeting within the next 24 hours. So that takes away some of the time pressure.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Cheryl, do you have anything to add?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, that covered it.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Sébastien has his hand up. I'm assuming it's an old hand, but I'll give you a moment.

And I've been told that on Spanish, we have only one interpreter and we cannot exceed the two-hour timeline. So again, thank you, Holly.

We have three more items. One is the ICANN 57, debrief on ICANN 56, which was essentially an opportunity for people to say what worked and

---

what didn't, to give guidance to those who will be planning ICANN 57. And a very short item on update on assemblies. So we have 35 minutes. If we can try to keep each of these sections a little bit below, we should be able to make it.

So I'll turn it over to Gisella on ICANN 57.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, thank you for that. I'm just going to talk very briefly about the information we have so far on ICANN 57, bearing in mind that we are still waiting for quite a bit of the information to come through, now that Meetings Team has been to Hyderabad and will be able to give an update.

We have an internal call with Meetings staff tomorrow. And further to that, we will have more information to be able to give to everyone. As this meeting is going to be quite tricky with regards to logistics, not only – sorry, I had a little echo there – not only with the hotels, but with the shuttles, the opening times of the conference center, etc. So once we have the block schedule, which will be released by Meetings Team, we can start work – well, we will already start working on the At-Large schedule prior to that.

I think the main thing that we need to decide is which groups will be meeting at ICANN 57. So they'll be meeting with the Board, GAC, ccNSO, SSAC, IPC, further to the 56 meeting. Identify any other groups we wish to meet with; the NCSG, for instance, who we've met with in the past. And we'll also be working with the RALOs and then tackle the various working groups.

---

So at this stage, I know that APRALO will be holding several activities at ICANN 57. And on the APRALO call last week, we started discussing this. And I think it would be good if maybe Maureen or Silvia could update us on what we have. And what I'm going to bring up on the screen in a couple of seconds is the Meeting C format that we have so far.

Over to you, Maureen or Silvia. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Gisella. I hope you can hear me a little bit better than before. Just briefly, Satish, of course, is our main man on the ground for this event. And [inaudible] before the activity [inaudible] India government [inaudible] so he's going to be pretty busy. Although it's being held in Hyderabad, we'll hold a regional meeting, but we won't have a General Assembly at this meeting. But we are going to be holding a capacity-building program for India-based ALSes, similar to the model AFRALO used in Marrakesh. I understand Satish is [inaudible] with Tijani about this.

At the same time, our Leadership Team will be coordinating a mentorship program for a group of ALSes. So that's going to be pretty hectic. As well as the NextGen and other Fellowshipers that will be at the Hyderabad meeting, we're apparently going to be hosting the tribal ambassadors from NARALO, who were supposed to be at Puerto Rico. So that will add a little interest.

The APRALO Leadership Team will be working with the Outreach and Engagement Working Group to look at outreach activities that we can

---

include into the program. And if anyone has got any ideas, they are welcome.

And Silvia may have something to add, but she set up an APRALO page so that we can add information as we update it, in preparation for Hyderabad. That's me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Back to you, Gisella.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, if I might?

ALAN GREENBERG: Whoever wants to talk multiply can talk.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Do we still have that echo? Is it distorted? So I just wanted to [inaudible] some strategy. There's going to be a strategy session schedule currently for the 3<sup>rd</sup>. That is, as we did last year, a full session dedicated to ALAC's strategic development. So it might be useful if we can plan that a little more in advance so we can have a full agenda on that.

The other item, I just wanted to make sure that everyone is aware of the development sessions that are going to be held on the 9<sup>th</sup>, the final day of the meeting. In the morning, there's going to be a RALO session. That is for continuing and incoming RALO leaders: Chairs and

---

Secretaries. And that's something that we'd like to develop with the RALO Chairs, in cooperation with staff. And then starting at noon on that [night], going to 18:00, there's going to be an ALAC development session. And again, that's something that we just want to make sure that we're all aware of those sessions and plan accordingly for your time. And then we also need to start developing the agenda for the ALAC development session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Heidi, two questions. Number one, do we know what both CCWG Accountability and GNSO PDPs are planning?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm going to hand that over to Gisella. She's aware of what the GNSO and others are currently planning.

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, thank you. Alan, the CCWG is meant to meet on Wednesday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> of November. That is currently all the information I have. And if you'd just [inaudible] with me for a couple of seconds, I'm going to put up what we already have for the GNSO. And this is linked to... We've already put it up on our ICANN 57 main portal. I'm just seeing if I'm able to show. Just bear with me for a second. I'll just get you the link, and if everyone can then just go from there to the link.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you just tell us what day they're going to be?

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Nothing's been finalized. But as it stands now, the Thursday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> of November, [inaudible] PDP Working Group face-to-face. I don't think they've decided yet on which PDP is going to be meeting face-to-face on the Thursday.

ALAN GREENBERG: As of earlier today, they are going to allocate multiple PDPs, and a half-day each. It's not clear if that means two or more than two.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, I will get an update from the GNSO support staff and send it on the ALAC internal list. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. So the translation of that is this is officially a seven-day meeting. The CCWG will be meeting on day zero, probably, prior to the meeting. The GNSO may well have PDPs going on, we suspect, but we don't know for sure, on day 1, which could be a significant conflict with the day we're deeming to be the strategy day. We have a fair number of people who are actively involved in some of these PDPs.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You have 60 seconds.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have 60 seconds for something. I don't care what.

And lastly, Heidi, if I'm correct, what you're saying is day 7 will not be... That people who are outgoing in either regional leadership or ALAC do not need to be there for day 7. And therefore, they will have a departure a day earlier. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We need to make sure, when the travel schedules are done, we factor that in.

I saw a hand up. Right now it's only Holly's hand. I don't know whether it's an old one or a new one.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, new.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought I saw Tijani's hand.

All right, we've clearly got a lot of work to do. We may end up with some real significant conflicts at this point again. But we'll see what we can do. Any further comments?

Olivier, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: What happened to me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sorry, it was a new hand. I thought you were saying it wasn't a new hand. Holly, go ahead, then Olivier. We have 13 minutes before the world expires.

HOLLY RAICHE: I would just like to put into play, we used to have at least one or two panels on issues such that they could be discussed within ALAC, policy issues. Now, what I thought was really useful about the last Helsinki meeting was we had a lot of discussion, which I attended certainly, on issues. I hope we still preserve it. I hope we don't just fill up our schedule again without talking about policy issues that are going on.

I don't know how you factor it in, but I'd certainly like to be involved in discussions on how we talk about current policy issues and updating everybody in ALAC on policy issues so when it comes time for who's involved in, or wants to be involved, in policy issues and responses, people have the background to do so. It's just a [inaudible], so I'll shut up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, may I suggest that when we send out messages asking people for topics to discuss, you identify them?

---

---

HOLLY RAICHE: I will.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I wanted to speak about logistics, but do I have time?

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead, but very briefly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. We SO/AC/[SGNC] Chairs – so these are the ICANN leaders, community leaders have received an e-mail from Nick Tomasso on the topic. And there's actually a link. And I didn't see that link being given anywhere. It's a link to the [crosstalk] post.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You have 60 seconds.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. That's nice. And so ICANN 57 Hyderabad, what you need to know. But one thing that hasn't been mentioned there is the visa situation. And for this meeting, there are going to be a lot more

---

people requiring visas. It seems that there will be a webinar on the 7<sup>th</sup> of September, 2016, to provide the community with a full update on logistics, accommodation, travel, and visas and stuff. I have a feeling this is maybe too late, because many of us travel extensively. And the month of August is a time that many of us take as a little breather, and that's the time when we can send the passports off for visa.

So could we please ask for this information, and any arrangements for visas, to be made before the date of 7<sup>th</sup> of September, which is a time when everyone is starting traveling crazily again?

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Visas are requested 30 days before they can be [required] online. The only requirement is to have the travel dates. That's the only requirement. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We will try to get information out well in advance. Any other comments on ICANN 57?

All right. The next item, which I'm going to move to the end if we have time for it, was a discussion of ICANN 56. We've already heard one comment from Holly that we had too much discussion on process and none on policy. I will point out that we didn't have any requests for anything on policy.

HOLLY RAICHE: I did. I did.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well... Noted. Update on assemblies. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. So there were three requests for General Assemblies. They came from AFRALO, LACRALO, and NARALO. Working with internal staff or other staff, we have been able to sort out the funds to offer two assemblies. That would be then given to AFRALO in Johannesburg next summer. And the NARALO one, which is being planned to go in collaboration with the ARIN meeting in April in New Orleans. The LACRALO assembly is being planned along with their LACRALO Roadmap, which is a process being implemented to address some of the challenges that LACRALO has. So that is going to be through other funding, not a fiscal year request funding. And that one is currently being planned sometime in autumn or early in 2017. So we look forward

---

to working with the various groups on the planning of those assemblies.  
Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Judith asked about payment for vaccines. In the past, in at least one case, there was some payment for vaccines and/or malaria treatment. I don't know whether they will in the future. We will ask the question, and I can ask staff to note that.

Anything else before we revert to the last item? I haven't heard requests for any other business, so I assume there is none.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I stepped away from my computer for a sec. Just taking you back to a discussion on your policy earlier, in the quiet time during this call, I read and reviewed all the documentation associated with the second review of the string similarities work, and I have a suggestion for the ALAC to consider that by making a short, supportive comment related specifically to the observations that is listed in one of the support documents from the working group, we would be doing a fair and reasonable thing. And I will copy the details of that through to Maureen.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if you could copy Ariel, because if it's just a statement of support of something that's there, I'll ask Ariel to do a first draft.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll do that, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. All right. Having no any other business, we still have about five minutes of translation left. And I'll go on to item 12, which is the debrief of ICANN 56. And I'd like to solicit input from anyone on the call on what they thought was particularly good about ICANN 56, from a point of At-Large scheduling, and what was particularly bad.

I will ask people to be very brief, because we only have, at this point, 4 ½ minutes. Jimmy?

JIMMY SCHULZ: I really liked that meeting in Helsinki, because we cut off all that stuff, like the opening ceremony. And the first time since I was a member of the ALAC, I had time to visit other constituencies, to see some tech stuff, and meet other people. And I also liked the cocktail for everyone, every evening, so you can gather and meet other people from other constituencies every evening, before going out to parties. That's the thing I really liked about it. And it was more [compromised] and more intense than all the other meetings.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone else have any thoughts? I'd like to focus mainly on the ALAC agenda, ALAC and regional leaders. At-Large Leadership, I think we coined the new term.

Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: What I was going to support Jimmy in that I was appreciative of the fact that there was a lot more cross-constituency discussions, a lot more time to attend different meetings, and had the opportunity – not just myself, but others – to get their heads around a lot of other stuff and meet other people. So it's not the sort of comment you wanted, but that's my response to the meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, interesting. I'll point out that the numbers that I got, attendance, I think, was about 1,800 people. I'm not sure. Was it 800 or 1,800? One of those. Staff, Heidi, do you know?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I would need to check that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Doesn't matter.



---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think it was definitely on the low end.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The largest afternoon cross-constituency meeting was attended by about 300 people. So lots of people had time off. So the cross-community work was good for those who participated. Many people did not. So I think we do have to address how that works.

Any other comments? We have another minute or so. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I was just going to deplore the fact that during those cross-community meetings, meeting staff took it upon themselves to try and ban other meetings from taking place. And that really isn't... That's just not on. Sorry. We ended up with a cross-community working group meeting which had no interest – well, no tech people. It wasn't recorded, to start with. We wasted 15, 20 minutes having to wait for someone to turn up. And we just started the meeting anyway. And it made the whole thing look absolutely stupid in front of the brand-new ICANN CEO. I know it was a fubar, but it just went too far. That's all. I needed to put that on the record. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep, thank you, noted. You're not the only one to say things like that. The simple answer was it wasn't really driven by staff. There were a number of vocal community people who gave them no choice. But I think it could have been done better.

---

Cheryl, you have one minute.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I hopefully won't take that long. I think the B Meeting worked better than I expected. I, in general, liked the format, particularly of course the cross-community. And like others have said, it would be better to have the room standing room only. But the rooms we were in were considerably, I would say, full, if not overflowing at sometimes. So we would have had to have used the overflow room, and that would bother me deeply. The ability to interact with overflow room is something that we haven't tested. And if we do get higher participation at future cross-community policy discussions, which I think are worthy of continuing, we may need to look at the logistics of some of that, as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think we need to look at all of the logistics. There was a fair amount of frustration amongst some people – I was one of them – for not really being able to an opportunity to speak in some of those sessions.

Last comments from anyone?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead. Daniel, you have 30 seconds. Go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes. The meeting was great, but one challenge [inaudible] was in the [inaudible] meeting, whereby if the numbers are expected to be low but it turned out to be really so big that some members ended up standing in the middle. Yeah, I think there should be at least [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I thank you all. We are about to lose interpretation, so I thank the interpreters for doing yeoman's job, understaffed in some cases. Thank you all for participation. See you online. And let's get all sorts of interactions going. And we'll see you in the meeting in August. Bye-bye.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, everyone, for joining. The audio will now be disconnected, as the meeting has been adjourned. Enjoy the rest of your days, evenings, or good night or good morning, wherever you may be. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**