EN

GISELLA GRUBER:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC call on Tuesday, 23rd of August 2016, at 04:00 UTC.
	On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Kaili Kan, Sebastien Bachollet, Vanda Scartezini, Harold Arcos, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Seun Ojedeji, Wafa Dahmani, Julie Hammer, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Yrjö Länsipuro, Allan Skuce, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, Sarah Kiden, John Laprise, Siranush Vardanyan, Alberto Soto.
	Apologies noted from León Sanchez, Sandra Hoferichter, Bastiaan Goslings, William Michael Cunningham, Ron Sherwood, and Ariel Liang.
	From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Yesim Nazlar, and myself, Gisella Gruber.
	Our interpreters today on the French channel are Claire and Camila; Spanish channel, Veronica and David; and Russian channel, Galina and Ekaterina.
	If I could also please remind everyone to state their names not only for transcript purposes but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other channel. This is every time you speak up, please do say your name.
	Thank you very much, and over to you, Alan.

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, Gisella. I'd like to congratulate APRALO and AFRALO for having all their ALAC members on this call. Perhaps we can teach the other RALOs how to do that.

Alright. Thank you all for attending. This time is poor for some people and perhaps great for others. I think this will be a somewhat shorter call than normal, but I've been proven wrong before on that one.

Before we start, is there anyone who would like to add any other business to the agenda? Hearing no voices, seeing no hands, I will assume the agenda is adopted as displayed.

The first item is action items. Heidi, are there any action items that require our attention? I see you put zero minutes for it, so I'm assuming there are none, but I'm giving you the opportunity to change that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Actually, yes, Alan. Thank you. When I was looking at the action items, I was pleasantly surprised to see that all but one – and that's something that does not require really the ALAC's attention – have been completed. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, excellent. Nice to hear. The next item is the policy development. Ariel is not with us today, but I will go over them very quickly. I'm looking not at the list in the agenda but at the actual wiki list of the status of things.

We have a few that are currently under drafting. One of them is assigned to me and I didn't realize it was. Oh, sorry. This is an old one. That's the Registrar Retention of Data.

There is one that is somewhat late, and is a request from the new gTLD process committee – or the new gTLD … I forget the name of them. The one looking at new gTLDs. Subsequent Procedures, I'm sorry. Holly and I have put together a document. I was supposed to have edited it and sent it in. I haven't. I would like an opinion. That is an informal document from the ALAC. I don't really see a need to have a vote on that one but if anyone feels strongly that we should, we can certainly do that. I'll give people a moment. If you think strongly we should vote on it, then let me know and we'll do something. Otherwise, it will just be submitted.

There is one currently being voted on, String Similarity. The Trademark Clearinghouse, I think Leon had the lead on that. I believe he decided, with my support, that we really didn't need to say anything about it.

There is the gTLD Health Index, which I believe we were going to do something about, but I have not had any volunteers on that. If we could put an action item to again request any volunteers for that one, the due date is September 6.

We have several – two I think or possibly more – comments related to the IANA transition. One is on the Naming Function Agreement, the agreement between ICANN and the new entity which will carry out the IANA functions whose name I cannot remember. Anyone remember what it is? They came up with a new name for the acronym, but I can't

remember what it is. And the Intellectual Property Agreement, I think Cheryl's recommendation on the ALT call we held a while ago was we should put in a perfunctory "we support this and thank you for getting it done on time." Other than that, I don't think anyone has [expressed] any real comments on it.

The .TEL Agreement, nobody has given any indication that they want to comment on that. I don't know if anyone has bothered reading it.

We have three new ones. There are three that are not formal public comments, but we are soliciting input on them. One is the Consumer Agenda that was written by Garth Bruen. The second is two documents on Hot Topics, both EURALO hot topics and At-Large community hot topics. These are documents that Ariel put together in response to a request from Rinalia, and we welcome any comments on those.

Before we go on to the next agenda item, is there anyone who would like to say anything or do anything? Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Are we going to have any time in Hyderabad to talk about Garth's paper and the larger [content] involved?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're just about to see a message going out to ALAC and regional leaders asking for topics. Please put it on the list.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We probably should have an action item to do that to make sure nobody forgets. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan, I wanted to remind you and everyone else that I believe there's going to be a special single-issue call in early September on the draft Consumer Agenda document. I also believe in addition that the Public Interest Working Group is going to be taking a look at that, most likely in September as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much for both reminders.

I saw a hand up for a second, but it's down. I don't know if that was Holly's old hand or someone who had second thoughts. Seeing no one else, we'll go on to the next item.

The next item is Rules of Procedure. No, sorry, Reports. Reports are normally submitted in writing, but we will give anyone an opportunity to give a brief update. I will actually explicitly call on Yrjö to give a very brief summary of the call that he, I, and the Chair of the GAC had the other day trying to explore just how we're going to use this new liaison position and what we should expect from it. Yrjö, sorry not to give you advance warning, but I know you can ad lib.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, thank you, Alan. I actually wrote a brief report for the liaison page just a few hours ago. But anyway, the idea is that the two committees that both have the public interest as foremost on their mind would keep each other informed on a general level of what they are doing, what they are planning, and so on and so forth. And more specifically explore issues where they could find common ground or possible cooperation and coordination and so on and so forth.

We agreed to have a call in September before Hyderabad – the Doodle is out – and prepare an agenda for that call. I promised to do that, and I would ask all ALAC members to send me ideas what are the items you would like to take up with the GAC.

Thank you, Alan. I think this is all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks very much. One of the things that Thomas Schneider was asking is now that we have a liaison, what are we expecting from it? My candid answer was there's not a lot of explicit expectation other than to make sure that when either of the group is doing something which the other one may well find of interest or mutual interest that we not be surprised by it. That we don't only find out about it when the GAC communiqué comes out, that they don't only find about it after we've issued some sort of message or advice on it, and that we just try to make sure that as things evolve we work cooperatively earlier on rather than after the fact reactively.

EN

That is not dissimilar from what we do with the other liaisons. There is no very hot agenda in any of them, but it's just a matter of being aware of what's going on and making sure that things are covered.

Anyone else have any comments or things on they want to bring to the attention of the ALAC on reports? That's working groups, RALOs, or liaisons. Seeing nothing, hearing nothing…

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I just wanted to ask if you wanted to go over the review of ALSes. That was Item 5 and you're on Item 6.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did I skip one?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Totally understandable.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's why you're here to remind me of it. Thank you. Once we're finished Item 6, we'll revert back to number 5. It's been a very long day

for me already, so I beg your forgiveness. Heidi, over to you on Item 5 on ALSes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you. I'll be very brief on that. There are several activities in terms of the At-Large applications primarily. In terms of regional advice, several – two from AFRALO, one from NARALO, one from LACRALO, and one from APRALO – those are all being awaited for regional advice. Also, staff is currently completing due diligence for an APRALO and an AFRALO ALS. The current number of ALSes is 201. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Anything from the floor on that? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we will now go back to our regular agenda and on to Item 7.

Item 7 is Rules of Procedure. If you remember correctly, we approved a number of changes to the Rules of Procedure in Helsinki, largely or completely related to the selection of the At-Large Board member, Seat 15. There were one or two minor problems with that, that we discovered afterwards, that we will be correcting.

There are also the set of changes that were presented in Helsinki, not discussed. Were discussed on the last ALAC meeting. Those are largely a set of corrections, clarifications, and one or two small changes to the rules. Again, we did discuss it last time. I don't plan to bring them up again unless someone has a specific issue with one of them.

The new changes this time are largely due to actions the ALAC has to take to ensure that we are ready for the new set of Bylaws and the Empowered Community that goes along with it. At this point, the NTIA has said they intend to let the IANA contract lapse, which implies the transition will go ahead barring any extraordinary action within the U.S. government. Therefore, once the contract lapses, the new Bylaws are de facto in force and the Empowered Community exists as defined by the Bylaws.

There are a number of issues related to that. Number one, we have to decide how we take action on any action we take in relation to the Empowered Community. Number two, the Empowered Community acts through an administrative group that has representatives from each AC and SO that is part of the Empowered Community. We need to name someone for that.

Could we have the – I see you have the Rules of Procedure – but could we have the log up? Sorry. That's the other document that's attached to the agenda. We will be going back to the Rules of Procedure in a moment.

Alright, the shaded ones are the ones that we've already discussed in previous times. The new changes are relatively minor. There is a change to the Table for Item 2. We'll be looking at that in a moment. There is a change in 5.9.9 that relates to the administrative representative of the ALAC. Can we scroll down a little bit more?

There is a change we will be looking at in 11.6.3. That is the one part of the earlier discussions where there was some concern expressed by

ALAC members, and that has been revised significantly and we will look at that in a moment. Can we scroll down a little bit more? Just to the bottom.

Then the following ones: there's a correction in 19.2, a correction in 19.11.6, and the two new sections, 23 and 24.

Now if we can go back to the Rules of Procedure and we'll look at those things in a little bit more detail.

The first one is the Table in 2. The definition Table. A little bit further along. Now on a number of these changes, Tijani has suggested that we reword a few things, and I'm completely in agreement with those. His definition is more accurate than mine for the Empowered Community, and there were a number of other changes he suggested and these will be incorporated along with any other comments. Can we scroll to the Table, please? There we go. The Empowered Community is simply defined there, as Tijani has pointed out not well defined, and it will be corrected. But that's simply an addition to the Table of definitions.

If we can go all the way to the bottom now to Sections 23 and 24, the ones related to the Empowered Community, we'll come back to the others in a moment. Right at the bottom of the document. There we go.

Alright, 23 essentially sets up the Empowered Community, puts it in the context of what it is and how the ACs and SOs have to interact. You will recall that it is made up of five ACs and SOs – that is the three SOs, the GAC, and the ALAC. Two of the ACs have chosen not to participate in it.

We passed a motion at the meeting in March in Marrakech that we do intend to participate in it, as is implied by the Bylaws listing us, and 23.3 simply reiterates that we are part of the Empowered Community.

Then 24 essentially enumerates how we will act within that. The ALAC has a number of rights and privileges associated with the Empowered Community. In all cases, I am suggesting with these Bylaws – when I say I, this is the group that was put together consisting of the five ALAC members on the CCWG plus Olivier and Seun who are the ones who have spent the most time and effort making sure they completely understood all of the issues associated with the new accountability parts of the Bylaws.

The first one essentially says any time the ALAC takes action within the Empowered Community, it must be done with the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the sitting members of the ALAC. That means we need at least 10 of the 15 members if all positions are filled. That's roughly equivalent to what we use as a supermajority, except a supermajority does not require all ALAC members to participate because some might be absent in any given case.

This is a stronger form and I think given the impact of the powers that we're talking about, if we cannot get two-thirds of the ALAC to agree, then I don't think there's any question that we would want to exercise these powers. But this is a crucial number, and I guess I'd like to make sure that everyone feels comfortable with it.

Anyone have any thoughts? You clearly don't want to be in a position where one person can veto action. On the other hand, you really want

EN

to make sure this is an action desired by the vast majority of the ALAC members representing the RALOs. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I think that two-thirds is a very reasonable rate. It is a very good [inaudible] minimum number of agreement for such decisions because the decision of the Empowered Community and the contribution of ALAC in the public community is something very important. We don't have to have civil position or civil action or anything like this, so minimum two-thirds is very good. I think that we need to make it stronger than the normal simple majority, and we did. So I do agree with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Just a few words to say that it's important for the accountability of At-Large and ALAC, this two-thirds majority vote on this type of decision. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alright, I haven't heard any. I've seen a bunch of tick marks, two affirmative actions, so I'll work on the assumption that this is something which is satisfactory. It is something we can change, of course. I would strongly object to making it lower. There could well be some argument for making it higher, but you don't want to set

thresholds too high because otherwise essentially you can have vetoes, and I think we want to be careful that that's not the case also.

In any case, I don't really expect the ALAC to be exercising these powers very often or perhaps ever, so I'm not overly worried. But certainly from an optics and accountability point of view, we do want to make it a strong decision of the ALAC.

The second one is that we are suggesting that if the ALAC uses this power, that unless there is some extraordinary reason why – and I cannot imagine what it would be – that this be done by an open vote as if it's a show of hands and that if we're going to take action with ICANN, we can't do it under the guise of secrecy. I believe we have to do it publicly. Similarly, I believe it should be a formal vote, not something done by consensus. These are serious matters.

Again, I don't expect a lot of people to disagree but if anyone does, please. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I don't disagree, but just to say that perhaps for some cases we have to have a secretive vote rather than a public one. So don't restrict it. Don't make it in concrete that it must be an open and public vote. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I agree completely, and that is why the words said "extraordinary circumstances." Now I will particularly look, one of the ones that is most interesting, I think, is that if we were to take action against a specific

Board member whether it's our Board member or someone else, this is a case where under normal conditions I believe the ALAC has taken a position that votes about people are secret ballots. This is one I believe that would be very different. If we are going to say we want a Board member removed, I think we have to do it in an open and public way. Now there may be some extraordinary circumstances associated with it that we may decide that in any particular case it not be an open vote.

But I would think that in virtually all cases that I can imagine right now that if we are going to exercise these powers, it should be exercised in an essentially as public way as possible. But the wording does allow an alternative if we can come up with the reason why in a particular situation. I see a tick mark from Cheryl.

The last one is one which is either the most interesting or least interesting, depending on how you look at it. The Empowered Community is essentially a legal organization. As such, it has to have people who will really take the action. Therefore, each of the Empowered Communities within it – the three SOs and the AC – have to identify a person who can act as their spokesman.

Now in all cases, the ICANN Bylaws strongly restrict what that person can do to exactly what their organization says they can do, so there are virtually no powers associated with the position. But you do need to name someone. The question on the table when we were discussing this is, should this be the Chair or should it be somebody else that can act in place of the Chair?

The general feeling was we already have a strong and very carefully identified way that the Chair essentially is accountable. There are processes by which the ALAC can remove the Chair should the Chair go off wild and do something inappropriate. Perhaps more important, there is a succession scheme for the Chair so should the Chair not be available for one reason or another, there is virtually always somebody else unless two-thirds – well, if two-thirds of the ALAC get wiped out, I don't think we're all going to worry about it a lot. But there is a succession plan that is carefully defined and, as such, by naming the Chair as the representative, the Empowered Community always has an ALAC participant in it. So that seems to be the path of least resistance.

There is a potential for the Chair, with the agreement of the ALAC, naming a delegate to replace the Chair. That would happen if the Chair is perhaps unavailable for some reason for this task. There are also rules within the Bylaws that say the administrative person cannot apply to be on the ICANN Board. So if the person who is the administrator could not run either in the case of the ALAC for the At-Large seat or submit their name to the NomCom, even though that's a confidential process, they would not be allowed to do it if they were the administrative person. So there is a provision in 24.3 to say that the person can be replaced, but with the full support of the ALAC of course.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. There is a case to where, for example, the ALAC don't [trust] the Chair at the moment. So without changing the

Chair because perhaps his term will finish soon so there is no need to change everything, they may decide to appoint someone else. So we don't have to make it, as I said before, something that cannot change. The ALAC is always free to appoint anyone to represent ALAC in the administrative role of the Empowered Community, but the default case is the Chair.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that is what it says right now but if the wording needs tweaking, we can certainly do that. We have Seun and then Cheryl. We cannot hear you, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me? Hello? Oh, okay, good. Yeah, 24.3, I'm just thinking the decision to actually delegate that role to [someone else] should be in accordance with 24.1. I think the votes [two-thirds] should be [set to] what is required in 24.1. I think it is [inaudible] relating to EC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	So you're saying that decision should be a two-thirds of all sitting members?
SEUN OJEDEJI:	Exactly.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I would suggest that maybe we want to use a normal ALAC supermajority for that. Getting quorums is sometimes rather difficult. I don't have a strong feeling either way, but I would suggest perhaps a supermajority instead of two-thirds of sitting members might be appropriate for that. But we can carry that out on the list. We have a couple of weeks left. Cheryl, go ahead.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks, Alan. Just the language that is often used in these matters is "the Chair or their delegate." That picks up on what Tijani was saying, and it's common language in these sorts of things. I'm comfortable with the majority as ALAC normally operates, but as you said, these are extraordinary and exceptional circumstances anyway.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, thank you. Tijani, go ahead.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much. First of all, I would like to express my joy to listen to Cheryl speaking with us. My intervention is about the majority that

Seun spoke about. I prefer to keep the normal supermajority that we are using in our work without the two-thirds. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Alright, so I think we'll make that change. And as we said the other changes Tijani suggested I think are all reasonable, and we'll come up with some wording hopefully that addresses all of those.

Now if we can go back to 5.9.9. This 5.9.9 is in fact part of the Empowered Community. That simply is the enumerated list of responsibilities of the Chair, and that is in accordance with what we just talked about. The Chair acts as the representative of the Empowered Community. But since it's subject to those provisions, that does allow someone else to be named under certain circumstances. I don't think that's a controversial one. It just rounds out the other changes and cross references them.

If we can go on to 11.6.3, please. Oops, we missed it. Alright, I don't know why that one is there. No, I'm sorry. Scroll down a little bit more, I think. No. Yeah, I don't know why that one is there. I think that one was an error in the log because that one had not changed since it was last discussed.

Let's try 19.2 and see, or maybe we missed another one along the way. Let's scroll to [red]. Alright, we missed one. We'll have to find it in a moment. This 19.2 is a correction of – a clarification actually – that Tijani mentioned that as it was worded it was unclear if the ALAC was going to name a Chair that was one of the ten members of the BMSPC or in addition to the BMSPC in addition to the ten. The intent was certainly

EN

that it was in addition, and this is just a wording change that clarifies that. Sebastien, go ahead. Or were you talking about another item?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, I wanted to talk about 11.6.3, but you…

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we'll go back to it then.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, if we can go to 19.11.6, please. This 19.11.6 covers how we do random selections. Two cases were listed there and in fact there's a third time when there could be a tie and that simply fills in the third time. So it just covers something that was accidentally omitted.

If we can go back to 11.6.3, which Sebastien wanted to talk about.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Alan. Just one point of [procedure] on how we use that. We often have a formal election for people who are [by] second ballot. When we offer the floor of seconded, you may have a lot of people who second. Then there is no need any more for any votes. I am not sure that it's a good procedure. I would like to have that somebody can second but not the full list of people seconding because

it creates different trouble. All the people will not put their name because always there are a lot of people seconding and otherwise, or they can decide to run knowing that they will not be elected and all of those type of behavior. And everything that if we want to second, we need one second. And as soon as we have one second, we stop there the list of people supporting one or another.

Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien.

In fact, we do not require any seconds at all for any of our, well, I believe for any of our positions, certainly not for the main ones. The procedure simply requires that someone be nominated. We have had a convention that people have seconded it and shown their support by it. I don't know how we can stop people from doing that, but we can certainly stop logging them if there's a strong feeling that we should do that.

As I said, it's really been a cultural issue, not part of our rules. It's never been part of our rules to actually second any of these positions and a second is not required. So I don't think we can do much other than either not log them or I'm not sure how we can actively discourage someone from saying, "I support that."

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I understand very well the point of Sebastien because it's a kind of intimidation. Suppose you have a position where I was nominated and everyone will support me. It will intimidate Seun to nominate himself because he will say, "Oh, everyone is supporting him so no need to nominate myself." And yet, we need his nomination because perhaps we need new blood. We need young people. So if he was nominated, perhaps people would vote for him and not for me.

So I understand it very well and it is a bad habit in ICANN and ALAC. We should stop it. By the way, I am thinking about disqualifying any candidate that is supported or seconded by several people because it is not fair because the nominated person doesn't have any [need]. So I understand it is a problem.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Plus, Tijani, if you had a rule like that, then if you or anyone was nominated, anyone who doesn't like you would say, "I support that." We would defeat you by saying we love you. I'm not quite sure that's something that we could manage.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, you are right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is that equivalent, there's an expression in English, "killing with kindness".

A show of hands, do we want to simply say we don't log those anymore, we don't have a column for seconds and we don't show them? I don't think we can stop people from sending the e-mails. I'm not sure I want someone editing and deleting e-mails because of that.

Go ahead. We have several speakers, Seun, Sebastien, and Holly.

SEUN OJEDEJI: But I think, yes, we definitely cannot restrict people from sending e-mails. Plus, one, people supporting people is a good thing but at the same time, like Tijiani said, it could also cancel people who try to participate from not putting themselves up. Nevertheless, it can be stopped. But we can, as much as possible, reduce the impact.

Maybe one thing can be done is I just like the way this current nomination for BCEC and BMSPC has been done in that [census]. So if only people [inaudible] the nomination wiki, that actually know who has been nominated. So maybe that can be done so that we don't get so much plus one unless somebody specifically starts doing it on the list.

So I think all nominations should be sent to staff and not necessarily to the list. But when it goes to the list, there's nothing you can do about it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right now, there are specific rules where nominations have to go for the formal ALAC positions and I don't think we can change that overnight. We could discuss it in the future, however.

I will say, however, that knowing Seun – I don't know if I know you very well – I don't think you would be intimidated. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I agree, Alan, with you that the first step could be not to have them log and it's a good first step. The second, I will say that we may not encourage people to do seconding and that's the first steps we can take and we will see where this goes in the future. And thank you for taking that into account in the future.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Holly, you had your hand up. Did you want to speak?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, no, no. I was just agreeing with your statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The bright yellow in the log was put in the wrong place. That's why we got to this statement, to this section to begin with. The one that should have been put on, and that was my mistake, is 3.5.4 to 3.5.6 if we could scroll back to there, please.

Someone who has control of the screen, could we scroll back to 3.5.4?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have control.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, in that case, sorry. Then everyone should scroll back to 3.5.4.

Okay. This is the section on essentially defining the fact that the ALT, the ALAC Leadership Team, is, in fact, the five de facto people that are named by the regions. The liaisons participate in this and there was previously a section saying past Chairs or other people could be also invited.

There were some strong objections to identifying the Chairs even though we were not requiring past Chairs to be included, that it was felt that there was no reason to identify them as having some special status and simply saying that they may be invited to participate in the ALT. And implicitly, if any action of the ALT is taken, then it's with the support of the ALT, not necessarily unanimous of course, but with the support of the ALT.

And the second one is to clarify that decisions taken are taken by the ALT and although the other people present at a meeting obviously may speak, any decisions are taken formally by the regional representatives. And that's simply a statement in terms of transparency to make sure that there's not a presumption that because other people are at the meeting, that they are all taking part in the formal decision process.

And all of this essentially maps to what we have been doing since way before I came on, I became chair, rather. But it just clarifies it to make

sure that it's completely open and not secret. ALT meetings are open to the public in general, but not many people actually participate in them. So this just makes it a little bit clearer and I hope this addresses the concerns that were raised when we last discussed this.

I'll open the floor in case anyone feels that there are still problems with it. And seeing nothing, then, oops, we have Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. No, I have no trouble with what you [inaudible]. I think it's better and just to be clear, for example, it gives me more reason not to be worried about the fact that I am not a member of the ALT or a member invited to the ALT than if I am an ex-Board member and I prefer [inaudible].

But I wanted to take this opportunity to talk about the 3.5.2. I really think that we don't need to change it now but I would like the ALAC to think about we may nominated four Vice Chairs. It's easier for them to be named and because I am a non-titled ALAC member of the ALT, it's quite a long title if it's a non-title and I think it would be good to balance the region and to be the voice of the region also from the ALAC. And I would like to suggest that we change 3.5.2 and 3.5.3 to four Vice Chairs.

Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think that is more substantive than you may be imagining and I would prefer not to try to do it right now. Let me explain why though. The Vice Chairs, as it says somewhere – I don't remember

where, somewhere else in the document – are expected to take on a moderately heavy load, heavier than the other ones and it has been a hard sell on occasion convincing certain people to be on the ALT. And allowing them to take a role where they are not promising to make a heavy time commitment into it other than attending the meetings and participating in the mailing list makes it a lot easier to sell these positions. So I would have no trouble saying that the number might vary. Right now it's one or two.

But I would strongly object to implying that everyone is equal because the people, in general, don't want to take necessarily an equal load. So I would be hesitant in that and should you bring that up again in the future to actually formally propose a change, I would think that would have to be considered very, very carefully.

Alright. These rules went out, I guess about a week ago and we have another two weeks to wait before because there is a 21-day period and sometime in the next week or so, I will do some rewording to cover the changes that we discussed today and the ones that Tijani had suggested on the mailing list. And then presuming there are no other major concerns, we will schedule an online vote in enough time for us to become part of the Empowered Community should we go ahead with that.

There will be one more vote. Once these are passed, there will be a vote that we will have to take and it's going to be a very curiously worded vote because it's a vote which will only take effect once the Empowered Community exists, but it has to take effect immediately. And that is to

reappoint our sitting Board Director to reconfirm that Rinalia is the Director going forward.

Once the Empowered Community exists, all the Directors have to be named by the Empowered Community. So essentially, if the Board suddenly goes "poof" and disappears with only the CEO left and the others have to be reappointed by the Empowered Community immediately. And that can only be done if they receive instructions to do so. So there will be a vote that will cover that, and as I said, it will be a rather curiously worded vote because it's a vote we'll have to take before we're empowered to do it based on the rules that will be covering us soon.

Yes, Tijani. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, I agree with you 100% that it is very strange words. I think that this issue would be better addressed if, in the Bylaws, we set up some additional articles that say that, for example, all the Board members which continue to seek to the end of their term as if they were appointed by the Empowered Community because I know that when we enter in the new era, the Board members would be appointed by the Empowered Community. Nobody can do it in its place. But I think that an additional article in the Bylaws would solve it. But it is like this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	A bit too late now. On the other hand, maybe we can cover this with the transition [article] in our Rules of Procedure. That's a real interesting thought and I'll look into that.

Maybe we can avoid having the vote and simply approve it by having it stated as a transition rule. That's an interesting thought. Maybe that will save the awkward wording I was talking about. Thank you for bringing that up.

Okay. Next item, BCEC and BMSPC. There is a vote going on right now that ends, I believe, on Friday, that confirms Tijani as the BMPSC – and it's spelled wrong in the agenda – and Julie as the BCEC Chairs. And I presume we're not going to knock them down, so I'd like to assume we will confirm them.

We will have outstanding calls that end tomorrow for BCEC and BMSPC members, either expressions of interest or nominations. If there are nominations, staff, check with the people to make sure they are willing to serve.

Could we bring up the two Tables?

As you will see in a moment, we have had very poor response to this. Now in some parts of the world, we can claim it's summer vacation. In other parts, we don't have that excuse.

For BCEC, we need ten people and five alternates. To date, we have eight people named. I suppose we can exist without alternates, although we did add them into the rules to try to make sure that we don't have any problems. But at this point, we are still missing anyone

from EURALO either to put their name up or to be nominated. And we are certainly missing sufficient people so that the RALO will kind of have selection, options should they choose. Although I must admit, the names I see there are fine names.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I don't see the name of Mohamed El Bashir and he nominated himself. So I don't know what happened.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see his name. He is the third name that is AFRALO.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Very good, very good. Very good. Excuse me.

ALAN GREENBERG: You just read that as an AP and didn't look at the name.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah. It's 6:00 in the morning.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. It's 1:00 in the morning here. So we give everyone some flexibility on this call.

In any case, we have another day left approximately, a little bit less than a day, for nominations. Please, if you know good people, then nominate them. There's nothing to stop the people in this group who are listening to the call right now from nominating people that they think would be good there. And yes, that will put them on the spot and force them to consider whether they will do it or not. But please, AFRALO is the only region right now that has three people.

And if we can look at the BMSPC list, that one is slightly better populated. We still don't have enough people from some regions or any people from some regions. And I would suggest that we need to do something about that.

Just to be clear, the process is the RALOs identify people and recommend them to the ALAC. Unless there is some crucial reason, I do not foresee that the ALAC would refuse to ratify any names assuming they meet the formal criteria.

Sebastien, I see your hand up.

One thing that a question was asked is can someone be on the BCEC that is doing the triage and selection of people for the At-Large selection at the time as they're on the Nominating Committee doing a similar task, or will be doing a similar task later? And in particular, they would be able to see if the same person had submitted their name in the two different places, assuming the timing overlap. There is no prohibition in our rules for someone being in that situation. If they were in that situation, then they are subject to confidentiality in both

direction and would have to act appropriately on that. And although I think it might be less than optimal, there are no rules against that.

There are similarly no rules about the same person being on the BCEC and BMSPC, although again, I think it would be preferable if they were not. But there are certainly no rules against it.

Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You answered one of my questions. But the fact that people in both committees, the same person in both committees.

My second point was to ask you to either [inaudible] or even all the people in this call know about BMSPC and BCEC. If somebody listen to this recording later, they may wish to know what we are talking about and if you want to [inaudible] candidate maybe it may be good to explain a little what it's about, all of that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. The e-mails that we sent out did go into a fair amount of detail, perhaps too much. Sometimes I think if an e-mail is over a page long or a screen long, that no one reads past that.

The BCEC is the group that will receive expressions of interest, people who are interested in becoming a Board member and select from that group those who will be presented to the electors. The electors are the ALAC that is sitting, so next year's ALAC at this point, plus the Chairs of the RALOs.

The rules are relatively flexible. Their obligation is, perhaps, a negative one. That is, they must not submit any names to the electors who they do not feel would make an excellent Board member. To what extent they may do any more triage than that is up to that group. The group is led by a Chair who is non-voting, and therefore, it is a decision of the group exactly how many to put forward.

When the process was originally created, it was envisioned that we should always have 15 or 20 people on the slate. The general wisdom right now is that there's not a lot of good reason for that and the BCEC should be doing its job and creating a reasonable sized slate. But exactly how it does that is its business and it's a confidential process. I've never been on a BCEC, so I will not speak to exactly what process it follows.

The BMSPC is the group that is responsible for running the election, running the whole process. And essentially, the BMSPC handles all of the arrangements for the selection process other than those which the BCEC handles, which is requesting expressions of interest and evaluating them, and other than any particular tasks that the ALAC has, such as appointing the committees or appointing the Chair. So the BMSPC, essentially, is a group that handles the mechanics. This is going to be the third one we do. We've got the process down pretty good. I suspect a group of ten people is more than we need, but it's the size we've used until now and there was no reason to change it at this point. I would not be surprised if seeing, coming out of this election, we decide that that group is perhaps overkill for a process that's essentially routine or will be routine once we do it the fourth time. But again, that's a decision we can make afterwards.

I see in the note, Cheryl says there's lots of reasons. There's a lot of reasons for not having too many people. I support that, but again, that's not my call.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I, too, support that.

ALAN GREENBERG: You, too, support that. Okay. And we have not. We had a fair number last time. I don't remember exactly. I think it was about seven people starting off. The first time around, we had three and we'll see what this BCEC does.

Any comments? And thank you, Sebastien, for suggesting I review this. Now that everyone on the call is expert, you can go and convince other people to actually put their names in or simply nominate them. You don't have to get their approval ahead of time.

Sorry, it's late at night. I can make statements like that. All right. Thank you very much.

We're going to go on to the next item, and that is the IANA transition and accountability. There's not an awful lot to say on that. The Work Stream 2 is starting. The work groups are pretty much all meeting at this point and I'm participating in several of them. And they're quite interesting. I think there was some fear that some of them would go off on random tangents and so far, the ones that I'm working on, I think are taking a very controlled approach to this and an approach to some

relatively difficult subjects such as ACSO accountability which is more than a small issue that we have to look at.

I don't have much more to say on this, other than if you haven't signed up for one or two or three, then please do. It's a good way to get involved in the process. It's a small chunk that you can bite off and become an expert in without having to absorb everything that's gone on around you. So I encourage people to participate. There is still an opportunity. If you wait much longer, it's going to be really hard to catch up, however.

And lastly, as I already mentioned, the indication from the U.S. Department of Commerce and TIA is they intend to let the contract lapse. I have not heard the results of what's happening with respect to the last letter from Senator Cruz and friends, but all we can do is be a bystander on any of that so we can just watch and see what happens. I don't think any of us have much control.

Any further comments from anyone else who's participating in these processes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I will give my hand off. Several people at the beginning of this call said it's nice to have Cheryl back as if she wasn't actively participating from her hospital room.

All right. Next item, ICANN 57 and I'm going to turn it over to Heidi and Gisella to go over.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, are you skipping over the review? Are you?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh. I'm doing a little off today, aren't I? The next item is item number ten, At-Large Review.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Sebastien? Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I had raised my hand on the previous topic. I just wanted to be sure that it's a segue to the item 11, that we have time within At-Large to have discussion about Work Stream 2. I think it will be important to discuss where we are, what are the findings of this in the working group or sub-group or [inaudible] teams because it's important to share with ALAC and At-Large where we are at that point.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we are going to be starting up what was called the IANA Issues Group again to look at the Work Stream 2 issues. The challenge is going to be to get people to participate. I'm not quite sure how we do that. But I agree. We should have more input than just the couple of people who were on each of the working groups.

At-Large review.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. We've had, for those of you on the working group, people have gotten an e-mail from Tom who is head of the CEO of your team. Just to update everybody, they are or have been working on an extensive survey questionnaire. It's going to be finalized probably in the next week or so and will be discussed at the next conference call, which I would expect would be in a couple of weeks' time.

They are also planning to attend for their regional ITS and have tried to get into it and have actually managed to attend a couple of other RALO groups. They are looking at, from 26 to 30 September in San Jose which will be attended by one of their meeting. That's where they're planning. After this survey, we will be planning on Hyderabad and, as you know, by that time, there should have been a draft report which will be

discussed at Hyderabad which at the moment, [Lars] is away on holiday but once he gets back, then we can put that sort of timeframe in place. But that's where we are up to. Are there any questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't think they were planning a draft report. I thought they would be sort of tossing out some ideas, but I didn't think it would be in the form of a report.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, "report" is the wrong term. They will have a lot to discuss. They will have, as I said, they're working on a survey. They will be looking at that and probably this will be, I would say, a very important meeting for them to actually toss around what they are coming up with for ideas. And so I will be working with Lars and with Alyssa and the team to organize something in the agenda for Hyderabad to leave time for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Hyderabad is going to be an interesting challenge and I'll turn it over now to Gisella, but I'll point out as we start working on the schedule, there are going to be GNSO PDP working groups on the first day or possibly the first two days. I'm not sure which. And for those of us who are participating in those PDPs, how we're going to split our time between At-Large and the GNSO is going to be a real challenge. And for better or worse, we have been more successful in getting people involved in GNSO PDPs than we were in the past. So it's more than one or two people who are going to be in that situation.

Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, thank you. So I'll give a quick overview of ICANN 57, where we are at, at the moment and also what we need to be working over as we have 71 days until Hyderabad, not counting.

Just a reminder that on the [inaudible] announcement that on the 7th of September at 15:00 UTC, we will be holding a webinar which will cover all the security, transport, shuttles, logistics, schedule, catering, etc. This will be led by Nick Tomasso and Tanzanica King from the Meetings Team. So we will be sending several reminders out to the community to make sure that we have maximum participation so that you can hear everything about Hyderabad and what to expect at ICANN 57.

Just a brief overview as we've had a little briefing ourselves, so what I can share at this stage which might help us with our planning of our schedule is – Yes, Olivier, I'm sending the document for you. We have, again, like Dublin, several hotels, five to eight hotels. They are all 30 to 40 minutes away from the Conference Center. Hence, the earliest start we're looking at is 8:30 and we have actually been recommended to start at 9:00 in order not to have empty meeting rooms. The shuttles will be running all day, similar to Durbin and there will be different routes to avoid delays like we had in Dublin where we actually had the possibility either to walk or to use city bikes. This, however, is not the case in India. It is not recommended and you cannot actually walk to the Conference Center, so they're working on the shuttle routes and we'll get more information on the webinar in September.

Information that Wi-Fi and breakfast are included in the room rates and the Conference Center is fairly easy to navigate, I'm told, so that will make having ad hoc meetings easy as well as during the coffee breaks, being able to catch up with the various groups. The meeting rooms are good sizes and I don't believe we'll have an issue with bringing additional chairs in as we're also expecting a high number of participants at ICANN 57. We did hear the number of 4,000, but I'm sure that Nick Tomasso will be able to update us on the webinar and chairs can be an issue in some of the venues depending on the regulations.

The gala is thought to be confirmed, but likely to be held on Saturday, the 5th of November due to the change of the meeting days. This meeting running from Thursday to Wednesday, it would actually correspond to the third day of the meeting, which is usually a Monday.

The weather, apparently it's going to be monsoon season so please do be prepared and I have checked. It will be 30 degrees every day, so we are looking at high temperatures.

With regards more down to the schedule, we have, I've put up the block schedule. It's all subject to change, as we know, and continuous moving target. I put it up on the screen, but we've got the Indian summer school which will be running from the 31st of October to the 2nd of November. Satish Babu is leading that from the APRALO side. And we have Alan and Olivier who will actually be presenting there. The CCWG will be meeting the day before the start of the meeting. That is Wednesday, the 2nd of November. As for the At-Large ALAC schedule, on day one, which is Thursday, the 3rd of November, we have ALAC strategy session and Wednesday, 9th of November, we have the RALO and ALAC

EN

development sessions. To note, there are no additional days here in Hyderabad. The meeting is running from the 3rd to the 9th and no longer.

The various groups identified for face-to-face, one-on-one meetings, we've had ccNSO. We've already secured a slot with them on Friday, the 4th of November at the end of day at 17:00. It's been penciled in, not yet confirmed. We have the Board on Monday, the 7th of November from 9:45 to 10:45 and there again, we chose a later slot as opposed to the early first slot in the morning just to make sure that we have everyone there and there are no issues with transport.

SSAC, we are liaising with Julie Hammer with a timing and content on that meeting. The GAC will be confirmed as the schedule is developed. Yes, we will be having a meeting with them and the time is yet to be confirmed. Olivier has already contacted the GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group. He's contacted the Chair Board, Paul Diaz, who is interested in having a meeting with us as well and we are currently working on timings and further to that, we will also work on the content.

APRALO will be very active in Hyderabad but I will be handing that over to Siranush to provide us with a brief update. And then the ALAC sessions as mentioned by Alan, we will be sending out a call for topics over the next few days hopefully.

So I see that there is Olivier who has raised his hand which might be with regards to what I said about Registry Stakeholder Group. Oliver, over to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. No. I was just going to add that I've also contacted the Non-Contracted Party Stakeholder Group, Commercial Stakeholder Group side of the GNSO. The response from them has also been positive to have a meeting, so I will be following up very shortly with them. Non-Contracted Party House, the Commercial Stakeholder Group, the CSG, [inaudible].

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just before handing over to Siranush for the APRALO update, as well as Heidi for the strategy and development days, I'd just like to stress that with regards to the working groups, we'll send out a note to the Chairs of the working groups to confirm those who wish to meet in Hyderabad and to confirm their agenda, as well. The RALO meetings, again, the Chairs will be contacted. The timing in India may not be favorable for maximum participation remotely, but we'll work on the best timings with the RALOs for those who do wish to meet in Hyderabad to allow for their region to be able to participate as much as possible.

If I may, I will hand it over to Siranush to provide us with a brief update of the APRALO updates to come.

Thank you. Over to you, Siranush, if you're able to talk.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Okay. Thank you, Gisella, and thank you, [Chair]. Before going to APRALO detailed activities in Hyderabad, I just would like to mention that unfortunately this is my last call as APRALO Chair, so from the next time, Satish will take over and step into the floor. I would like to thank everyone for your lovely messages, private and through the list and for all the words you told to me. I'm really humbled working with you.

Going to Hyderabad meeting, APRALO is in the process of planning. We have met couple of times with Leadership Team, and we are planning to have our next call during probably coming one or two weeks. We are waiting for couple of confirmations from Satish, who is in charge, truly now, for the planning process. We have submitted on behalf of APRALO the official letter to Indian government to support Indian ALSes to participate in Hyderabad. We haven't heard from them yet, so we still are waiting to see if they can give out funding. They funded actually the summer school. Gisella mentioned about this, which will be prior to Hyderabad. We also want our ALSes from India to be there.

Satish also is in contact with several NGOs, for whom we would like to have capacity building in Hyderabad, and we will rely on support of APRALO [inaudible] finalize the names on NGOs who will come. We also are trying to find out. There are several ALSes from APRALO who will be there, who will finalize the lists, who are being [inaudible] their own funding. Fortunately, we are not going to hold general assembly there, as to due to a quick relocation of the [inaudible] from Puerto Rico. We

are also planning to have showcase, and I'm sure with the support of staff and with the support of some donors who we will go for funding, we will have a very nice event there.

At this point, this much from APRALO.

GISELLA GRUBER: Siranush, thank you very much for the update. Much appreciated. If I can now hand it over to Heidi for a brief update on the strategy, as well as the development sessions. Thank you. Over to you, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much, Gisella. Hello, everyone. I'm going to mention actually three items. The first is on your agenda under 11.2. You will see At-Large Leadership Session. That is actually the name of this strategy session. That one will be taking place all day on the 3rd of November, and I'm sure that the ALAC and ALT will be developing that as we get closer to Hyderabad.

The next item is under development sessions. Please keep in mind that all continuing and new ALAC and RALO leaders will be participating in the development session on the last day, the 9th. The RALO leaders will be going from about 8:00 to 12:00, and then the ALAC leaders will be going from 12:00 to 6:00 PM on that day. That will be developed shortly, and there's been some discussion about what the format might be. We'll be getting to you on that to get your inputs, as well.

The last item is the Tribal Ambassadorship. I see Loris is on the call. She's welcome to discuss this. In brief, what this is a fiscal year 17

special request that was approved. Loris submitted that request. What that will bring about are two indigenous North American – U.S., actually – people have selected by a Selection Committee within NARALO, and they will be going to Hyderabad.

It is very similar to a fellowship type of activity. They'll be participating in the fellowship [inaudible] meetings that they go through, as well as the At-Large meetings. They will have a coach or a guide from At-Large in Hyderabad to bring them through the meetings, and then they'll have some other significant reporting to do post-meeting. That's a fantastic new program which has gotten positive feedback from the Board as well on that. I'm giving it back to you on ICANN 57.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Heidi. I've covered all the items that I wish to cover, and I will hand it back to Alan. If you wish to meet with any further groups, I think this has covered the main groups now. I'm not sure if Julie wishes to mention anything about a meeting with SSAC. I have responded with her e-mail, and I will be working with our ICANN staff support for the SSAC on identifying a time and then working on the content, as well.

As I'm not sure Alan or if anyone else has anything to add to what's been said, I'll hand it back to you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just want to talk a little bit about travel and visa issues. As Heidi said, the hotel situation is going to be challenging at best. I see

EN

Tijani's hand is up, so let me give it to Tijani first before I talk about travel and visas.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I would like to ask our staff, Gisella and Heidi, please try to coordinate with the other staff members of ICANN, of the other departments, because there will be a lot of overlap and I will have an important commitment for half a day or a day, I think the first or the second. So please try to coordinate with the other people so that there is not an overlap, especially for the important sessions of ALAC, since I am a member of ALAC and my presence would be compulsory for me.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, does the staff know what the other [thing] commitment you have is?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. It is the Onboarding Program.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I just want to make sure. Many of us are going to have commitments for the first couple of days, and there's no way we can avoid overlaps, I'm afraid. We can try to minimize ones that people have specific interest in, but there's at least four or five of us who should be

spending the first day in the GNSO, and clearly that can't happen completely. It is going to be challenging.

Visas and travel. I've received a preliminary travel itinerary. I presume the rest of you have also, but I don't know if that's the case. This is not one at my selection, but simply one that can be attached to a visa application. The only criteria is that it have the right days on it, not necessarily the right routing or anything like that.

I presume we will also be getting a hotel reservation because of that one. That also is going to have to be something that some of these applications have to include.

The visa application that I'm completing, which is an online – I don't know if everyone is eligible to do that or not – is the most … I won't try to put adjectives on it. Just before the call, I was trying to fill in a little form which said, "List all the countries you have visited in the last ten years." When I did, it said, "Sorry. You have run out of space." It turns out, by the way, if you have that question on your online forum, there is a little widget at the bottom of the box to enlarge the box before you type them in. That might work. I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It also asked what hotel did I stay in last time I was in India. That took a bit of research, and my visa number. It's a challenge, I think is the right wording. It also asks for things like contact and a phone number of

someone in India. I don't know if Satish is volunteering his home phone number for us or if ICANN will be providing that information, but there are so many things in that visa application that I don't know how to fill out that it's going to be a real challenge. So plan early and assume that this is not going to work well.

The other things. Heidi, have you had any input on visa costs? ICANN officially says they will not pay for visas over $100. I know some people have visa costs in the order of $250. Have we gotten that clarified?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan. From what I have heard, you're correct. It is $100 for the visas. Perhaps exceptions can be sorted out individually with Constituency Travel, but I don't have any more information other than that $100 maximum.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I would ask anyone who knows they have more than $100, and I believe Cheryl and Seun are among them, to give the information to Heidi so she can start the exception process. People should not have to be doing this themselves if there's a half a dozen people who have to do it. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. The e-mail of the Constituency Travel, Alan, did you receive the right arriving dates? Because they didn't count the CCWG meeting day, so I don't know if it is only for me or for you too.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I believe as of two or three days ago, the people who were only asking for a day of funding had not been approved yet.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So it has not been approved.

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is yes, it was not only you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Second issue. Alan, you asked the question before, and I answered it. If you follow the e-mail of Constituency Travel, you will find a link for these applications. In this document that they give, I think at the end of the document, you have the name of the reference in India with the phone number, with address, with everything. I told you that on Skype, but it seems that you didn't read it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did not see that. Thank you very much. I did look at that link. I apparently didn't go far enough down. I guess I'm subject to the same rule. I only read the first page, also. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alan, I actually did check before receiving the notes on Constituency Travel, and I had seen the online registration. When I received this, I just

see that I cannot apply for the visa online. Actually, the requirements are a lot bigger. I don't really know if I can apply for that visa because I need to have a confirmed trip and also a confirmed hotel. I have already sent all this to Constituency Travel, and they will say that I'm going to receive all these confirmations soon, but only after that can I go and try to apply for the visa.

That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I did receive a travel itinerary, which I, in theory, can use. I have not received a hotel. I have applied for the invitation letters. Some people say they've gotten the ICANN invitation letters, but not the Indian invitation letter. I haven't received either of mine, and it's been over a week at this point. I'm still hopeful.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Alberto, for the online application, you don't need the hotel reservation, neither the itinerary. So please make the online application and wait for those documents to go to the embassy and submit your application.

It is in two steps. The first is to do the online application, to print it, and to add the necessary documents and then go to the embassy. This is the way it should be done. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, he said he's not eligible, so there may be countries that cannot use the online process. I don't know that for a fact.

Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to tell you, I received my itinerary and I asked the travel agency to change the date. It was done a few hours later. I wanted to [inaudible] should be more. If you have this type of wish, add them and they do it quite [efficiently]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. I did the same thing because of the Internet School of Governance. I got a revised itinerary back almost immediately. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. If you go on the ICANN Social on Facebook, there is some discussion on lessons learned from this visa application. There are some concerns. Apparently, some missions are asking for the original letter of the Indian government. I'm not sure how that would work out with that being sent out or how because I was under the impression this was just going to be e-mailed out and you had to print your own copy. Some missions apparently don't accept the copy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sigh is all I can say. Yrjö.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. One point about the [pro-forma] itinerary that the ICANN Travel is sending out. It specifies a point of entry, which I think is for Hyderabad. However, for people planning to come via Delhi or via Mumbai, I think that they should notify the ICANN Travel about that because I think that if you indicate a wrong point of entry, that might cause for troubles at arrival. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I have that same concern that until I see my real itinerary, I'm not sure what my point of arrival is going to be. We may have problems like that. I'm not quite sure how to address that. Hopefully, by the time you go for your visit, you will have your real. I got my invitation last Friday or so to actually set up my real travel, and it's supposed to be set up by this Friday. I doubt if I'll have mine done by then, but the intent is to get the real travel done moderately soon. Maybe by the time you have to actually present an itinerary at an embassy or consulate, you may have the real one.

Siranush, go ahead.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thanks, [Chair]. What I have heard from different mailing list is we need to apply for a conference visa, specifically for a conference participation. A tourist visa will not be eligible for us to enter India. Be careful while submitting your application that you are going for conference purposes. It may take four weeks for some countries to wait

until you get approval or disapproval from the Indian embassy. Take care.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for those encouraging words. I did read somewhere that if you apply for a conference visa, you can extend your visit to be a tourist. I don't recall where I read that, but I did read that at one point, to the extent that that helps.

Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Just one point about the flight. You say you may have your final itinerary. My thought was they will wait for you to have your visa before they will issue the final ticket for many purposes. It was my thinking. I don't know if it's true or not true, but it's interesting what Yrjö say about the point of entry because they didn't discuss that at all. It may be something we need to take care of quite soon. Maybe we can say a collective mail on that issue to the mail for the people.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. Heidi, can you check into that, please? Will they in fact wait until you get a visa to issue your final ticket, in which case they're going to be paying some awful high rates for tickets?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan. I will check into that. I know in the past, that is the rule, but I will see if that is the case for this time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Nobody is going to get their visa that quick, as far as I can tell. I've spent several hours online trying to fill out the form already, and I'm not finished.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just one final other point on that. You should also check just to make sure that all of your vaccines and immunizations are up to date. If you need malaria, etc., those costs will need to be covered by every individual. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Heidi, can you please send up the kind of vaccination that you needed? I didn't see it anywhere, so can you please tell us what kind of vaccination we need? Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Your doctor should know.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, your doctor should know. Take a look at if the welcome e-mail from Constituency Travel has that. Definitely then yes, I would just check with your doctor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think that ICANN is not going to put themselves in recommending what medications. In the U.S., that's what lawsuits are made of, so I don't think you're going to get that, [Leon]. I'll certainly share all the inoculations I have, but I've had most of them for many years, not necessarily related to this travel, so which of them are necessary or advisable for Hyderabad may differ from the ones that I personally have or other people have.

                              I think to some extent, you're on your own.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, for those of you who don't live in malaria countries, Hyderabad is a major malaria zone. Malaria medication is not guaranteed, but it is advisable for people for whom like me, mosquitoes love. Anything else about the meeting? Going once, twice.

Alright, just a very short comment. As you will have noted, the process to select the leadership and liaisons for the ALAC for the coming year has kicked off. The Chair, which is the part that has to be done first, and we are obliged to finish that a fair amount of time before the annual general meeting, according to our rules, has been started. I was already nominated, and I will be accepting it and will be giving the ALAC some information about what I would like to do if I am re-elected as Chair. Sebastien will be happy to see very few people said plus one to my nomination.

After that, once the Chair is selected and we know what region the Chair is from, then the process is to select the ALT, the people willing to act as the Leadership Team from each region. Certainly, people should start thinking about who from their region. Remember, this is the ALAC members for the incoming ALAC, so in a few cases, there will be changes. In some changes, because of NomCom appointments, we don't know who the people are yet until they're announced, but typically someone coming in is not in a position to take a leadership role. There have been exceptions in the past where that is not the case.

Lastly, the liaison positions will have to be filled. The practice has been in recent years, and according to our rules, that if a liaison is doing what we believe a good job, that they can be reconfirmed without opening the positions. That, of course, is not true for the GAC liaison, where we committed to doing a full search this time.

[Beeping sound]

I wish someone would try to make that not happen, but I guess my wish is not honored. You now have a demonstration of how much power the Chair has. Oh, it stopped. I said that at the wrong time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. I tried to hang up and just stay in the AC room, and it won't let me get out of the bloody thing. The phone will not disconnect. Now, [rather than] throwing my phone through the nearest glass window, which is sorely tempting, can somebody with the control you're seeking bounce me off and I will stay in the AC room?

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, when you volunteer to work with At-Large, you do not leave. For those of you into very old rock music, there's a song called Hotel California [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hotel California, yep.

ALAN GREENBERG: In any case, what I was planning to do at this point is go to the ALAC Selection Committee and first get an opinion from the ALAC Selection Committee as to whether for the GNSO, the ccNSO, or the SSAC liaison, whether we should open the positions or not. Of course, for the SSAC liaison, it is not our call. The person has to be accepted by the SSAC.

I would value input from any ALAC members. I'm not going to ask for it on this call right now, but if any ALAC members feel strongly that we should not open the call or we should open the call for each of them – and you can have different answers for each – please let me know. I'll collect those answers and let you know what the general feeling is, but I will be going [for] the Selection Committee to see whether they have an opinion on this or not.

Sebastien, go ahead. Sebastien? We cannot hear you. John says he can hear him. Can anyone hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, I can.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm going to go on mute and turn on my speaker on my computer and see if I can hear Sebastien then.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't know what happened because [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's working. It's working right now.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It works for everybody? Okay. Thank you. I don't know what's happened. I hope that Alan can hear me, too. Thank you.

I was not there when the [inaudible] was written, and I didn't support that, but I am a little bit surprised that we don't wait to have the full membership of ALAC before [assigning] any leadership position. We are still waiting for two names, and I am a little bit puzzled that we didn't know them and we will not allow them to run for some other leadership position. I think it's not a good behavior and not a good opening of the way they can participate.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. We should have the names of the NomCom appointees before the ALT is selected or nominations open for that. At least, that certainly is typically what happens.

There was a lot of discussion when the rules were rewritten on the timing of these selections, and there ended up being a very, very strong feeling among those who were involved in the process. There were a lot of people involved in the process and not just ALAC members at the time. The sitting ALAC was in a better position to select someone who would be a good Chair for the coming year than the incoming ALAC where in some cases, there's a turnover, as we had last year, of almost half the people in the ALAC.

There are different opinions of this, but that was a considered opinion and the rules were written in conformance with the belief at that time. We can certainly reopen anything, but it was not done by accident or by whim. It was done with full understanding that yes, this does at some level disenfranchise people, but it also does not put people in a position of having to make decisions about people they know nothing about as their first act within the group. It was a conscious decision. We can debate whether it's something we want going forward, but it certainly was not done either for any negative reasons or accidentally.

Is that a new hand, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, please, Alan. It's concerned me too, but it was not my point. My point is that we close the possibility to nominate people [to a] Chair position the 31 of August, and we will not know the two ALAC member at that time from the Nominating Committee. I think it's a difference. We can have a very good person coming from the NomCom, and we will wish to have him or her in the position of the Chair, but we can't because we don't know their name today.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's not much we can do about that. As I said, our rules require that that position be locked in and selected, including runoff elections if there are multiple candidates, in enough time to select the Leadership Team at the annual general meeting. Certainly, it's something that we can discuss, but at this point, there's not a lot of flexibility. I waited

pretty much until the last possible moment that we could do it and still abide by the various rules and processes.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Sebastien, when we changed the rules to make the sitting ALAC member to choose the Chair of the next year, there wasn't unanimity. We were spread on the two positions. Some people think that the new ALAC should select its Chair, and the other said, "No, those people just came, so it is better to have the ongoing ALAC members to select the Chair." There is not a real supermajority for this or for this, but at the end, the majority was for the sitting ALAC to choose the Chair. The rules are like this now. If you want them to be changed, you can propose, but now, it is the rules. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The other thing to note is every year, we do have some new people going on, and every year, we have a significant number of the new people coming in and abstaining for a number of votes because they don't have the history and knowledge to participate in things. I would really fear a situation where there is a significant turnover in the ALAC. We might not even have enough people voting, and there are quorum rules about how to vote, or we might have a Chair selected by five people. That, I think it would be more harmful than the opposite.

In any case, as Tijani says, it wasn't unanimous, but there was a strong majority who did believe that that was the right way to go. That is what

is in our rules today, and I'm afraid we are bound to follow them until we change them.

Anything else on that? As I said, I would appreciate any input people have on the issue of the liaisons. Liaisons are an interesting position in that everything depends on the relationship between the liaison and the group. If it works well, then it's really great. If it doesn't work well, it's not only as if we didn't have a liaison. It can be a negative. It's something that we need to consider carefully.

That's all I have. For Any Other Business, I just have one item unless anyone else has added Any Other Business along the way. I did ask earlier.

My one item is, you'll note if you scroll up in the agenda to the attendance, we have an apology from Ron Sherwood. You will recall that last time we talked about Ron, he was very ill. I'm sorry that he couldn't make it here today. I'm delighted to see that he's in a shape that he sent his apologies. I would ask those who are in contact with him to say we – and I will say we on behalf of the ALAC – are delighted to see that he considers himself still part of this group. We are anxious to see him back.

With that, if there's no other comments, then I will adjourn the meeting. I said we were going to end early. I did foresee more than two minutes early or a minute and a half, but I will give you back that minute and a half. For those of you in my position, an extra minute's sleep. Thank you all.

I guess we do have a meeting before Hyderabad. We may even have two meetings before Hyderabad, so I'll see you online and we'll see you all together in a month. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye. Bye, all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone. The meeting has been adjourned, and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call, and wishing you all a good night, good morning, or good day. Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]