YESIM NAZLAR:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to ALAC's Monthly Call taking place on Tuesday, 27th of September, 2016 at 12:00 UTC.
	On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Sébastien Bachollet, Sandra Hoferichter, Vanda Scartezini, León Sanchez, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Yrjö Länsipuro, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Satish Babu, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, and Glenn McKnight.
	On the Spanish channel we have Harold Arcos. On the French channel we have Mayida Assouma and Mona Al Achkar.
	Currently we don't have anyone for the Russian channel.
	We have received apologies from Kaili Kan, Seun Ojedeji, and Carlos Raul Gutierrez.
	From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Ariel Liang, and myself, Yesim Nazlar.
	Our French interpreters today are Claire and Isabelle. Our Spanish interpreters are Veronica and David. And our Russian interpreters are Ekatarina and Galina.
	Finally, I would like to remind anyone to state their names before speaking not only for the transcript purposes but also for the interpretation purposes.
	Over to you, Alan. Thanks very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have a rather tight and full agenda today. There's a lot of little items. I hope we'll be able to get through them all. We are quorate barely, but sufficient to proceed according to the rules.

The first item we have on our agenda that has any substantive issue – I note Heidi has put zero minutes for the review of action items which means there is nothing that requires the ALAC's attention right now. And the first substantive item is Policy Development.

Do we have Ariel on the phone? Go ahead, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Alan. The only one that requires action from ALAC, or specifically Alan, is about the input request for gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. Alan, I trust that that's on your agenda and [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: It will go out in the next day or so come something or high water.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you, Alan.

And then there's a new public comment and it's about the Latin American and Caribbean DNS Market Study. And I'm still [inaudible] LACRALO as well and that due date is November the 1st.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, Ariel. Can you speak again? Your voice is fading in and out and I'm not quite hearing you.

ARIEL LIANG: Can you hear me better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: A little bit. Go ahead.

ARIEL LANG: The new public comment at present is the Latin American and Caribbean DNS Marketplace Study, and that's the only new public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I presume we will have a comment from the Latin American and Caribbean RALO? Is there anyone here from the RALO who would like to commit to that? León, go right ahead.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, this study was presented at the LAC DNS event in the Dominican Republic, and I think that if you haven't had a look at the study it's worth for us have a look at it. The comments that I've already made to ICANN staff interpretive support is that I believe

that it is a useful report, of course, but it has some improvements to be made.

So if you're okay and you approve I could, of course, draft a comment on this study. I could coordinate with both Harold and Vanda so that we can have a coordinated view on this DNS study.

ALAN GREENBERG: I not only support it I strongly support it, yes. Please go ahead.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, anything else?

ARIEL LIANG: Nothing else on my end, but Vanda has raised her hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Are you [inaudible] me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can hear you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, just to say that we're going to present this report and the whole [inaudible] during the LAC space in Hyderabad. So the LAC space will take place on Friday, November 4 at 10:30 on Hall 6. I can send more information for that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're likely to be in meeting for most of that time, however. So that's not likely to be accessible to anyone in our group.

Anybody else any comments on that issue? I'm assuming that's an old hand, Vanda.

Alright, onto agenda item #5 – the ALS applications. Who is handling that from staff?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The total number of ALSes is 206 and increasing. There are none being voted on. The regional advice is being waited for [Ray's] news in APRALO and a forum for governance and the Internet [inaudible] and AFRALO and Article 19 EURALO. And that is it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe Article 19 is being voted on now as of last night.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thanks. Apologies. Then that one is being voted on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any comments/questions on ALSes?

Alright. There's been discussion in a number of RALOs about decertifications. I haven't heard any action right now. I'm assuming nothing is going to be happening prior to Hyderabad.

The next item is reports. As is our norm, we will not have each liaison, RALO, and working group report, but if anyone has anything they'd like to highlight in their written reports, please [inaudible].

Olivier, go right ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Just two quick things. One on your previous point – decertification. We actually in EURALO had a Board meeting yesterday and discussed this. It's of course very significant a thing to decertify an At-Large Structure and we actually decided to suspend it for the time being and give them more time to get their house in order.

On the liaison reports, the GNSO Council call this month is actually happening after. It's on Thursday, and so I'll put everything as usual on the wiki page [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Anyone else?

Seeing nothing, hearing nothing other than a beep, I'm assuming we have no other comments at this point. And we are well ahead of time at this point.

The next item on our agenda is to hear from Rinalia on the Board Workshop and other Board activities. Rinalia is on the call and I'll turn the call over to her at this point.

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Rinalia. I can hear you. This is Heidi.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM :   Okay, great. The Board had a three-day workshop in Brussels I think about a week ago. It was a very good meeting, and as intense as before but perhaps even more so because it was right after the Cruz hearing and also there is a lot of work being done.

We have all the new incoming Board members present and I'll just say their names just for your information in case you haven't noted them: Martin Butterman, Khaled Koubaa, Akinori Maemura, Kaveh Ranjbar, Becky Burr, and of course Cherine Chalaby is returning to the Board. I think in terms of turnover, that's about 25% turnover and it was remarked that it's unusually high for the Board.

Within the three-day workshop we had two Board meetings, and I had posted the resolutions to the ALAC working list which I hope that you had looked at. I think the items that garnered the most discussion outside and within the meeting itself was the .com Registry Agreement, items related to PTI (Post-Transition IANA) and further consideration regarding the .registry IRP Final Declaration.

Outside of the Board meeting itself we spent a significant amount of time discussing processes related to the new gTLDs, specifically the IRPs (the Independent Review Panel Process), the Reconsideration Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process. And I think you would have seen the outcomes of these discussions from the resolutions that emerged out of the Board meeting.

One of them was to task the CEO to undertake an Independent Review on staff interaction with the service provider for the Community Priority Evaluation, and the other decision was to have the Board Governance Committee go back and review a particular case to make sure that all the gaps were addressed.

We also looked at the Ombudsman report on .gay and we had a call with the Ombudsman to receive clarification on what his position was and to ensure that we understand his reasoning.

Then we also had a strategic session where we explored trends that may affect ICANN, and this was essentially initiated by our new CEO. It was a very good session and it involved group work among the Board members.

In terms of operational items, typically we would start our workshop with discussions with the CEO. He's [down on] four months into the job and he would present his CEO report to us and he would tell us what's preoccupying his mind, what the status of icann.org is, the status of the people, the changes that he's making or thinking of making in which he would want Board input. We also agreed on a framework on our Delegation of Authority between CEO and staff, Board, as well as community. And I think this may have implications for Work Stream 2 on Staff Accountability as well.

I think we came to an agreement on meeting location decisions where we affirmed that the selection of meeting locations – and this is the ICANN Public Meetings – will be made by ICANN staff but whenever there is a change of location, that decision will involve the Board. And of course, anything that involves expenses above $500,000 will come to the Board regardless.

We received a lot of updates from briefings at this workshop. There was so much briefing that I think my back hurt after the second day from sitting down. We went through updates on the transition, status of litigation for ICANN, ICANN positioning and communications, Board advice registry status, status update on engineering and IT especially on security. There was also a security briefing on ICANN 57 in Hyderabad. And one thing I wanted to touch on with you later is about recalibrating the Review Process.

There is also a continuous discussion on opening up Board sessions and meetings to the public. This is not an easy process.

I'm sorry. Are you still hearing me? I'm hearing beeps.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're hearing you but we're also hearing a beeping sound.

YESIM NAZLAR: We'll try to determine that [inaudible].

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. I'll just continue for the sake of time.

We're working on opening up Board sessions and meetings with the public. It's not an easy thing to do. Otherwise, it would have been done already. There are issues related to confidentiality and liability. And it will be a gradual process.

So for the workshop in Brussels we had three open sessions: impact of new Bylaws on ICANN – and you may receive a similar one I think tomorrow – Accountability Work Stream 2 topics update, and also an engagement with RIPE NCC on topics that they cared about and that they wanted to engage with the ICANN Board. And I think that for Hyderabad there will also be open sessions with the Board which the community can attend and listen to. Generally these sessions will be recorded and the link will [be] posted, and I have asked staff to post the link of the recording from the Brussels meeting. They are working on it, and the last update I received was that it would take two more days.

I would like to end by touching on this challenge of Review recalibration. We know that the reviews are important accountability mechanisms for ICANN. What we would like to do is to engage with the community and to figure out a way of how to improve the Review Process itself, particularly the AoC Reviews. The challenges are volunteer bandwidth high cost. On average the historical cost is about USD $800,000 each. There is a long implementation period generally. The last SSR Review took 42 months and the recommendations are still not fully implemented. In some cases, the conduct of the review itself took a long time. The SSR also took 21 months compared to ATRT 2 which took 11 months. Other challenges include the different understanding about purpose and value and impact of review. There are scoping issues, vagueness of recommendations, and prioritization.

Generally it's difficult to measure results and impact. So what we want to do is we want to move forward by having a discussion and dialog with the community to find a path to move forward without sacrificing accountability, and hopefully we'll have a solution for this problem.

That's all I have at the moment, and if you have any questions I'd be happy to address them.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a couple but I'll give anyone else a head start if they want. If not, then I'll start.

Working backwards on the reviews – and we have an echo somewhere – I'm encouraged by what you're saying. The CCWG Accountability somewhat slavishly put all of the AoC Reviews almost verbatim into the

Bylaws under the assumption that somehow when that document was written they got it perfectly right. And I'm not sure that is at all the case. We did manage to get a small number of changes put in, so I'm encouraged that you're going to look at it afresh.

I have no doubt that the costs are high. On the other hand, all of the issues that have been raised out of them I believe are important ones and I'm not sure we can pretend that just because it's expensive they're not important. So I look forward to that.

The Saturday sessions that you held that were public ones, I unfortunately had another commitment and I couldn't attend. What was the attendance like for those?

Rinalia, are you still with us? Can anyone hear me?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I can hear you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then can we have an answer? I'm presuming everyone else can hear both of us.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I didn't count the numbers but I think maybe I saw about 20 or so, and mostly from the European region because of the timing. I didn't count so I can't really confirm.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Just curious. Lastly, you have the current status of what's happening in the U.S. Congress. There was a lot of mailing list action at one point as riders were going in and out of bills. I've heard nothing in the last week or so. Do you know what the current status is? We are three days away from the 30th at this point.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes, we get updates and it is up and down so I cannot really say in terms of what's going to happen. I think what we agreed on was that we have to respect the Democratic political process of the United States, and whatever the outcome is we would just have to deal with it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just asking for an outcome of is it in or is it out at this point? I just haven't heard anything for the last several days though. Just curious, wondering if you had better information than I do.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. That's a good answer.

Anyone else? We're going to end this meeting early if we keep on at this rate. Anything interesting about what's going to be happening in Hyderabad? We're still a month away so obviously the whole world can

change in between and obviously whether the transition has happened or not will impact things.

I see León has his hand up, so I'll stop blathering and give it over to León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. What I put in the chat the last update I got on the riders in U.S. Congress is that at this point there was no rider restricting the transition but it's also true that it's still on the table and it's become a bargaining chip for both parties, so as Rinalia said, it's too soon to tell and we need to wait for the outcome on the discussion in Congress.

I'd like to know a little bit more on what you said, Rinalia, on the delegation of powers from CEO, Board, staff, etc. and also in regard to the transition, there have been some questions on how is the Board going to honor the fact that they said that regardless of the transition actually taking place there were going to be changes on the Bylaws implemented going forward. There are of course some Bylaw changes that depend on the transition, but there are parts of the Bylaws that don't depend on that and those parts were committed to being implemented as far as we know.

So were there any discussions on the Board meeting on this issue? That would be [for me].

ALAN GREENBERG: Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. So we've been having a discussion about this for quite a while now, and I think that opposition is consistent that regardless of whether or not there is a transition, we are committed to make the changes in the Bylaws that are not dependent on the transition itself. That is the way I see it. There is no reason not to make ICANN a more accountable organization, León. That is where I stand also.

ALAN GREENBERG: Rinalia, can I ask a follow-on to León? I'm presuming that means yes, the Bylaws will have to be gone over to extract the IANA transition items, but you have not assigned that to staff at this point. We have not allocated staff time to do it until it's demonstrably needed. Is that correct?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes, correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So we will have a period of time –

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: We're all in standby mode, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: But we will have a period of time at which the lawyers have to do their work, then we have to go through a Bylaw approval process to make that come into [inaudible]. That's the path I see forward.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Anyone else? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. And thank you, Rinalia, for this comprehensive report. I'd like to ask you, you just said that you will go ahead with the modification of the Bylaws even if the transition will happen. But the transition will not stop for other [inaudible] perhaps delay until the end of the year, but after that I think that it will resume the process of transition. So changing the Bylaws now means that we have to review the Bylaws because the Bylaws were changed according to the transition. So everything related to the transition is there.

In my point of view, the wise position is to say, if the transition will happen today and it is postponed, we will wait until the end of the year. If it will not happen at all, in this case we will review the Bylaws. So that

will make ICANN more accountable without the transition. But changing now the Bylaws means that we will have to review the Bylaws that we have reviewed. In my point of view it is more or less a waste of time and perhaps it's not the right way to go. But this is my point of view anyway. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Tijani, for your point of view. I appreciate it very much. I think that first we have to wait for what's going to happen in Congress. Once we know whether or not there is a transition or not, then pathway forward will be clearer and I think it will be a very concrete topic of discussion in Hyderabad. There we will make the decision on how to move forward together because the Board will not do it on its own.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia. I'm presuming that that will happen if there is a clear decision it will not happen in and certainly in this year or perhaps in this Presidency, whoever the next one is. If for some reason it is simply delayed but looks like it might happen within a few months, then I presume we will still be on hold until that happens or doesn't happen.

Anyone else?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Or it could also be a delay of a year and we would have to factor that also in terms of how we move forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Then it's a judgement call, do we put the effort in for one year? It depends how certain I guess it is at that point. There are judgement calls ahead, no doubt.

                            And we still have an echo from somewhere. Maybe it's Rinalia. I don't know.

                            Anyone else have anything for Rinalia? Rinalia, I'll just say that you could have an open microphone and that sometimes causes –

                            Seeing no other hands, hearing no voices, thank you very much for being with us.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Where are you? You're now in Europe these days.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Correct, Europe [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so we're not inconveniencing you in time too much.

Next agenda item… Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I had trouble unmuting and I was just going crazy pressing the buttons and it didn't work.

I hope Rinalia is still here. I was going to ask her, when it comes to the subsequent round of new gTLDs there has been some requests from the Board for further clarification as to where everyone stood. Has any decision been made in any direction so far or is this something that's been moved to possibly in Hyderabad where a decision might be made or maybe later?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Hi, Olivier. Thank you for the question. I think there is a call for comments [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Rinalia, you're very faint.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Can you hear me better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Much better. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. As far as I know there is no decision point for the Board on this topic. I do not know whether it will come up in Hyderabad. I'm on the Planning Team and I have yet to see the proposed agenda. It takes a bit of time. I don't think we would be ready to make that decision until we've received all the input from the communities, and as far as I know there is a call for comments right now, yes – that the ALAC is submitting something on?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, there's no call on that particular thing but you did send a letter to the GNSO, and the GNSO has not yet responded. So that's certainly part of the items that you're waiting for.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes, so we need to have all the information points covered before we would make any decision, and certainly from the last round of discussions where I had asked for the At-Large's and the ALAC's input to feed into the discussion. I think the agreement was that we would not shortcut the process and that we would wait for the all the reviews to finish, including the PDPs.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is the case, but the Board is now on record as asking those groups is there some way of speeding up the process or starting a "round" of gTLDs in parallel with the work going on? And there is discussion certainly within the PDP –

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I think the Board is just exploring options. It hasn't initiated discussions on this yet. I think staff is right now just gathering the information for us so that we can have a good discussion about it. It hasn't happened yet. It's possible that it may happen in Hyderabad, but there is no guarantee. It depends on the input coming in from community.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Rinalia, you know very well the position of At-Large about this issue, and I hope you will be our voice there on the Board. No initiation of any round, any report the [end of all] reviews. This is our position and I hope you will [defend] this position if you wish to because you are representing all the community, not only At-Large but this is the position of At-Large and I hope you will have the same point of view to defend and to really lobby for [inaudible]. If you don't do it like this, you know exactly what here we have if we open now a new round. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks, Tijani. I think the At-Large position on it's very clear and I have delivered it as your community's perspective so there is no misunderstanding there. I think the Board understood that the last time and if it needs to be repeated I will be happy to repeat it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Alan. I just want it to be put in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're in the queue and you're on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I realize obviously that Board members shouldn't be pushing forward the views of their own community, but I think we need to frame this question in a rather different way, which is does it serve the public interests to have another round of new gTLDs? And the only way that we can find out is for the reviews and for all of that work to check if the first round was conducive to being in the public interest. It's the only way we'll find out. We can't just speculate on this and I wouldn't want to say today that no, gTLDs are bad or yes, gTLDs are good for general people out there. But definitely need to fight off any vested interest push or lobbying to have another round sooner rather than later before the reviews are done. It would just not be correct and I think that ICANN would come under great criticism especially immediately after the stewardship transition taking place and the great criticism if it went ahead without actually being aware of the facts of the first round. I think that's probably how it should be framed. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Olivier and Rinalia, if I may. ICANN is going to be subject to great criticism from some circles no matter what ICANN does on any issue. That's almost a given. It's a question of who does the criticism come from and what is the import of it if any? In this particular case, I'm going to work on the assumption that if a decision were to be made that we should release new gTLDs before the entire review process is complete, as we have originally said, and if Rinalia were to support that action of the Board then we would have extensive discussions with our Board member as to what the rationale is for changing the tact and not following what is currently the At-Large advice.

I presume we would have that with the Board as a whole, not just with our Board member because we have been very strong on that. And I have no doubt we would issue new advice which was explicit if that question came up before the Board. So let's not assume bad outcome –

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes, and I would certainly encourage you to make that statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks. Regardless, or if the question comes up?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I think whenever you see the need to remind the Board or if you see any danger that the Board is going a direction that you don't agree with, you should definitely do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. And I presume you would come and talk to us if you were going to take a position that is radically different from what At-Large has advocated. So I don't think we need to debate whether you would do that or not.

Anything else for Rinalia? We have managed to use up all of our extra time almost. One last call for people to unmute or raise their hands.

Then I thank you very much for your time. You're welcome to stay with us or leave if you have other [places] to go.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I will stay with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The next item is BCEC and BMSPC updates. This is the selection process to either appoint a new Director or to reaffirm Rinalia will be our Director for another [ten] terms, depending on how it comes out. We are going through a full selection process as is mandated by our Rules of Procedure. And I'll turn it over first to Tijani for BMSPC and where do we stand at this point?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. The BMSPC had a joint call with the BCEC three days ago. It was the first call [inaudible] and we exchanged more or less ideas and we included the [alternate] people. We did so because we wanted them to know at least how and what the job will be and how we will act.

For the BMSPC, the first task we have to do now is to publish a timeline. I have already prepared one and discussed it with Alan. We are almost in agreement. Now I sent it to Julie for her point of view for the BCEC because they have to agree on it since the timeline will affect their work. And once I receive the agreement from Julie, we have already set a time to publish it but she [inaudible].

The BMSPC will have its next call in the beginning of next month, let's say before 10 of October. It will be a call before publishing the timelines. Adjust the timelines so that everyone will agree on it and everyone will have it in hand because it will be our – if you want our timeline for the whole process until the end. And also I will discuss in the next call a little bit about the guidelines for the 2017 round of the selection.

This is all for the BMSPC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Question – what is the timeline that you're projecting right now to have the guidelines for the BMSPC ready for ratification by the ALAC? You will recall in the new Rules of Procedure explicitly called for the ALAC to have to take formal action to approve them. Do you have a prediction when you think you'll be ready? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, I was muted there. I am sorry.

Yes, everything [depends on] the timeline and the proposed timeline so I am trying to display cheer. I don't have it under my eyes, but the

ratification will be not later than 18 of October. The publication will be surely around 10 or something like this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Pending what Julie says when we come to her, the natural time to approve these guidelines would be the ALAC meeting in October. Unfortunately, there is no ALAC meeting scheduled in October. It would be scheduled on the 25th which is already into the week where some people are starting to travel. The question I have for the ALAC right now is what if we were to schedule a meeting – and not necessarily a two hour meeting – but a meeting on the previous Tuesday, the 18th? That would give us an opportunity to meet and do any discussions which we need in preparation for Hyderabad. It would also give us an opportunity on a teleconference to ratify the guidelines to avoid a week or a five day vote which otherwise we would have to do.

A general feeling from the people, if we were to schedule a meeting which would be on the third Tuesday of the month instead of the fourth would people be supportive of that and could attend? We would of course must, we would have to have quorum. Otherwise, we couldn't approve these guidelines. I'm going to ask staff to look at a Doodle to see whether we can in fact put together a meeting, perhaps a one hour meeting, on the 18th in lieu of the meeting which would have been held on the 25th. Does anyone feel this would be a bad thing to do?

I see one checkmark which came from the suggestion. I see Olivier has stepped away. And we have two checkmarks. So we have several checkmarks.

Alright then, staff can take an action item to do that. We would probably have to go outside of our normal rotation of meetings because the following meetings are already scheduled so we try to have to find the least offensive time for this meeting that we're inserting.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Yes, Alan, we can also do the following. We can initiate a vote on 12th October and we will have the result by 18th. It is easier for us because I am not sure we will have quorum in this meeting which is just before when people are preparing for the Hyderabad.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's do a Doodle and see how it looks. We'll decide in enough time to go either way.

Alright, Julie. You're up next.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Alan. Yes, we had a good meeting with the BMSPC where the [BCEC] at the moment hasn't met separately. We're in the process of filling out a Doodle poll to try and find a regular meeting time at some

stage of the week. I'm hoping we can get a meeting in later this week but it depends how quickly people fill out the Doodle poll.

We have got some draft Code of Conduct that we've used from previous years that we're looking at. I don't see any big reason to change that, but obviously the group this [year] needs to look at that and reaffirm it. I've also put together some draft Candidate Requirements and I'm working on draft Operating Procedures and Guidelines and I've got some of those in place but obviously they need to be talked through with the BCEC and make sure that they're comfortable with what I've currently got down and also Tijani's going to give me a little bit of input on that.

I have received the timeline from Tijani, but without having had the opportunity to finalize our process with the BCEC and then have a look at the timeline in relation to that with the rest of the group, I don't really have any feedback on that timeline at this stage. I'd certainly be aiming to try and meet the 18th of October target to have the procedures and guidelines ready for the ALAC to approve, but as yet as I say we haven't met and so we're really right at the very beginning of the process.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Julie. I just checked my schedule and I realize I'm traveling on the 18th so that would probably not be possible for me anyway. So let's keep in touch, Julie, and if you don't think you'll meet a deadline similar to what Tijani has that is somewhere around the 10th or the 12th, then we need to perhaps come up with a Plan B as to how we

get it ratified in enough time for you to send out the Expression of Interest. So let's look at that.

JULIE HAMMER: I'll certainly try to meet whatever timeline you need me to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments on the selection procedure?

Alright, hearing nothing, seeing nothing, then we will go on to the next item. The next item is #9 – the IANA Transition and CCWG Accountability, and we have León Sanchez on update on the CCWG Work Stream 2 processes and an update on the IANA Transition which I think we already got in discussions with Rinalia, but anything else León has to add is open game. León?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. There's really not much to add. As you might be familiar with the Work Stream 2 discussions, they are taking place as we speak and the different subgroups have been having very fruitful discussions but no conclusions yet. We will be holding a plenary call from the CCWG within the next two weeks and it is expected that we will be reviewing of course the different work that has been done in the subgroups. But there's really not much to report at this stage to the ALAC or the At-Large community.

I hope that on our next monthly meeting we'll have more information to update you as to how the Work Stream 2 discussions and

implementations are advancing. And as for the IANA transition, I think that as you said, the update has already been provided in the discussion with Rinalia. So that will be all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I note Tijani's hand is up but before that, I'll note we did have a call of what was called the IANA Issues Ad Hoc Working Group, now renamed the ICANN Evolution Working Group, and we did review the status of all of the work teams to the extent that was possible at that point. Within At-Large we have pretty good representation on every single one of them, I believe, and they're currently progressing at very different rates. Some of them have had I think as many as seven or eight meetings, other ones haven't quite met yet. But there is progress and we do have significant involvement but we could always use more if anyone else wants to get involved. There's still plenty of work to be done.

Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. It is [exactly] because I wanted to give you an update of the two subgroups that I am focusing on. I am in four subgroups but I am focusing on only two because I realize that it is impossible to be as deeply involved as I want in the whole four subgroups.

I am in the Human Rights Subgroup and in the Jurisdiction Subgroup. I can tell you that those two subgroups are perhaps the most difficult, the

most controversial subgroups because we are discussing subjects that for which we have absolutely opposite point of view among the community. During the many calls those are two subgroups that have had a lot of calls. We are now I think we are in the sixth or seventh call for both and we are a little bit turning around. My last call on Jurisdiction was yesterday night – yesterday morning for you but night for me – and I noted that we are progressing a little bit because now we've found the way that people try to understand each other.

At the beginning it was more or less people who are wanting to keep everything as it is, a California incorporation and the location and everything is there, nothing should change. And other people want to change. There is [Inaudible] kind of those people some who see that there is change needed and certain layers of jurisdiction. Others want to change everything. So this was the situation at the beginning, but not now. Yesterday I said that people try to get closure and to have more a common position so now we are discussing the gap analysis, the gap between requirements and the [implementation]. It means that if the accountability mechanisms that we decided on they are implementable in the California jurisdiction or not, if in the implementation there is gaps. So now we decided to go this way and I think that at this stage I hope that in the future in the upcoming calls we will advance better.

For the Human Rights, it is another space. I see that some people in the community wants to discuss more than it is needed, more than it is mandated for us because our mandate is to come up with a frame of interpretation of the human rights as it is in the Bylaws. And some people try to discuss other things, to discuss things that is not in mission more or less, and I always say that we have the Annex #6 of the final

document of Work Stream 1 which defines our tasks. They are very well defined, and we have to stick to them. I hope that in [inaudible] I will find that people finally want to stick to those requirements, to those topics, those tasks, and that we will advance better. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. I think on the issue of jurisdiction and human rights, there was no closure at all in the CCWG. It was deferred to Work Stream 2, and this is viewed by many people as the opportunity to take up that same battle and it's going to be up to the Chairs, co-Chairs, whatever, of the working groups to try to keep people on target.

Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. First of all, I want to thank everybody to rejuvenate the working group taking into account the IANA Stewardship Transition and the Accountability, now named ICANN Evolution Working Group. I think it's very important that we as a community we try to coordinate our inputs into various subgroup [of] Drafting Team of the Work Stream 2. I am rapporteur of the ICANN Office Ombudsman Subgroup but I don't want to [inaudible] on that.

Two points, the first one is that they start from my point of view to have some discussion among the subgroups and that's useful [inaudible] think but [both] between the question of the opening of the documentation and [inaudible] the Ombudsman cannot. There are two subgroups [inaudible] together on that. The other point is that it could

be more important for At-Large, it seems that all what [it's stay] from the ATRT2 [related] to accountability will now fall into the work of the Work Stream 2 and we are still waiting as a Work Stream 2 group [of] any inputs from the Board for that. But I think if it's come to be really what it was suggested, then there is more work for Work Stream 2 and we have to be very aware of the fact that the connection between ATRT 2 and Work Stream 2. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I was going to just add one thing about the IANA Stewardship Transition, what is the ICANN Evolution Working Group. I'm putting a link on the chat which takes you to the last call that we had, and if any of you are interested in listening to the call you'll get the updates from all of the different Work Streams, not just the ones which Tijani and Sébastien have addressed.

It's a long call, but you can fly forward, fly backwards, etc. and in a couple of days' time there probably will be a transcript also both in English and in Spanish. That's a little commercial break.

One more thing though on what Sébastien has said. He mentioned that the Work Stream 2 is going to take on ATRT 2. I didn't quite understand. Does that mean there will not be an ATRT 3? Because I would have thought that the following Accountability and Transparency Review that looks at the previous work, and a second comment on this is that there

usually is a staff update on implementation of ATRT recommendations. I'm not sure, Alan, whether we had a staff update recently on the implementation of those recommendations of ATRT 2. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Olivier raised an interesting question but I think it's separate the point I want to raise. Do we will have a ATRT 3 and what will be the bother of the ATRT 3? It's still a question we have to address. But I was talking about the implementation of ATRT 2 and there are specific issue who are still not done by the Implementation Team, and it seems that it will fall into the responsibility of Work Stream 2.

                           ATRT 3 maybe decide to go ahead at the right [at the date they] were supposed to go or postpone it still a discussion I guess we will have in Hyderabad. But that's two different issue about ATRT. Thank you. Hope it's clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. To phrase it another way, staff in reviewing the implementation of ATRT 2 decided that several of the items overlap heavily with already planned deliberations of Work Stream 2. Responsibilities of the Ombudsman I believe is one of them. And those were essentially allocated to the appropriate subject group within Work

Stream 2. So it's not the whole [inaudible] of ATRT 2, but just the implementation of certain ATRT 2 items.

Any further questions on this agenda item? Seeing none, we will go on to item #10, At-Large review, and I'll turn it over to Cheryl, or Holly and Cheryl.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl, you do you want to start?

ALAN GREENBERG: You may as well start, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I know. People should now have an e-mail inviting everybody to actually fill out the survey form, it is out. The survey form was run past the original working party, and there were things that were clarified, expanded, or whatever, so the final review questionnaire is now out, and we will be waiting for people to fill it out. So we're hoping everybody should be filling it out by now, so far.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Holly. I'll note on the GNSO review that was done several years ago, among the more negligent people not filling out their survey were the GNSO councilors. Let's see if we can do better in this group. Olivier?

HOLLY RAICHE: That would be a real disappointment.

ALAN GREENBERG: What, if the GNSO councilors don't fill it out?

HOLLY RAICHE: If the equivalent ALAC executives don't actually fill in [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Not only the executives, the whole ALAC. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Alan. What I also saw was that the –

HOLLY RAICHE: Are there any questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The request for input, was that also sent to other SOs and ACs? So it's not only At-Large.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, no, this is going far and wide.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, okay, that's all I wanted to basically say. It's also gone for the GNSO, it's also gone pretty much everywhere. So that's why. That's all, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct.

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you, Holly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sébastien, we've got two calls and Olivier is not speaking, so Sébastien, go ahead, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can you hear me, Holly? Because we heard Olivier very well.

HOLLY RAICHE: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, but I want to be sure that Oli also, because he was talking at the same time as Olivier then. Okay, yes, I take your point, Alan, about the ALAC members, but I think we need to be a little bit more ambitious, and I would like very much that our goal will be to have at least one answer by each of our elders. This time, we're supposed to do the review not just of the ALAC body, but obviously, the full organization, and I know that it will not be easy, but if we can try to have this objective, it will be better from my point of view. And it's why I suggest when the Chair of any RALO writes to the ALS that they remind their members that it will be great if they can fulfill the review questionnaire. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. I will certainly take it as given that the RALOs have a vested interest in this and they will be pursuing that. We can't, obviously, control what the ALSes do, and I can't control what the RALOs do, but I'm hoping they will take it to heart. From my perspective, I would just not want to be embarrassed by the fact that half the ALAC hasn't bothered filling it out.

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

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thanks very much, Alan. We got that survey, and obviously, the process of the At-Large review is ongoing. I wondered whether the issue of a

second At-Large selected board member was on the table, and if not, what was the procedure for putting it on the table?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know how it is we could put it on the table. It has certainly been something that has been discussed with the reviewers, and if it's something that people say to the reviewers, they're likely not to drop it. They obviously have to believe it would be a good thing and I can't control what they believe. I know Nick Thorn has gone on several RALO meetings – that I've heard, in any case – and said, "This is your opportunity to send messages to the Board. Do you have anything you want to send?" That's a pretty clear message to me. So I can't guarantee outcomes, obviously, but if you think it's an important issue, then it should be raised, and it should be raised regularly.

Anyone else? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices. I will say this slowly to give people time to unmute or to raise their hand. We will go on to the next item.

And the next item is Auction Proceeds Review – Charter Review. This is an item that I'm afraid I slipped up on. I thought this had gone out to the ALAC at the time I received it, and unfortunately, the request to send out to the ALAC did not go to staff and apparently I didn't send it out. So now we're in an awkward position of almost all of the two weeks we have been given to review it having passed. The Drafting Team – of which I am Vice Chair, by the way, which is why I missed it, because I'd been spending so much time on it I forgot to do the minor little homework of sending it to the ALAC. I have served notice we will

not make the deadline of this Friday, but we do have an obligation to review it sometime very quickly afterwards.

What I would like people to do is review it on your own. If you have any comments, please send them to me and to the ALAC list. We are looking for comments explicitly which would stop the ALAC from ratifying the charter as written.

That's important. If you remember on some other CCWGs in the past, each of the groups has taken the charter and then amended it and approved an amended version. That is really problematic, because they now have an amendment which is approved, which the other chartering groups have not seen, and it's really hard to synchronize afterwards. And in fact, what has happened is we didn't synchronize afterwards, and we ended up having slightly different versions that each group would have preferred to see. So we're looking right now for changes that would be required for the ALAC to ratify. This charter has received far more work than any other charter than I am aware of in the past, because it is unique in a number of ways.

There is a potentially very large amount of money involved. At this point, if the .web auction stands without being addressed by courts and changed, then we're talking, at this point, of at least $235 million that will be given out by this process. At worst, it's $100+ million, but probably significantly larger than that. There is a great potential problem for conflict of interest. That is people setting rules which will then put them at an advantage when they then apply for money. To be clear, the CCWG will not be allocating money. It may, however, be setting guidelines for the types of requests that are legitimate or not

legitimate. It may subdivide the money into pools. There are all sorts of potential options.

So the question is, is there anything in this charter which would imply the ALAC will not ratify it? And if so, we need to serve notice moderately quickly. As I said, it has gone through an exceedingly large amount of work to get to the stage we're at now. There has been strong Board involvement, because clearly, the Board has to ratify – the Board doesn't approve the charter, but the Board has to agree to abide by the outcomes of the CCWG, and they have done that with the charter as written, and conflict of interest certainly was among the very large issues.

The other issue, which was a surprise to me, is because of the way the Bylaws – and specifically the new Bylaws – are written, it would be very difficult to use this money for anything that is not in line with the current mission of ICANN. The Applicant Guide Book, when describing the auction proceeds, said it could be used for instance for things that are good for the Internet. It would appear now that that is too wide a definition, and we would not be able to go that wide, so it has to be in support of our mission, and obviously, we're going to have to interpret those words, so that should be interesting.

So please, if you care about this – and I don't know anyone who doesn't care about how to spend several hundred million dollars – then please review it. If you have any questions, I suspect most questions I can answer based on the deliberations of the CCWG charter Drafting Team, but there may well be things that you find that we've missed, so comments, please, on the details.

We have a queue on, of Judith and then Olivier. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, Alan, I was wondering if the group is – the group has been closed. It was a closed group, because I know I had tried to join about a few months ago, after the Helsinki meeting, and was told that it was closed. Was there any work on trying to open up the group? Because that could have helped with other people in distributing it, and I'm just wondering if any work has been going on in that area. Right now, it's a hard time with the holidays coming up to drop everything and read something immediately, and it would have been helpful if we had more time.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is not a large document, and a significant part of it – the last half – is largely boilerplate, which it doesn't change. So it's not that long and we do have to look at this in the next number of days, so please, do take the time. CCWG Drafting Teams are always closed groups, that's the way we've done it from the beginning. We have two –

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No. I was talking to them before the Drafting Group, it was closed. When they were just in meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, the only group that has met so far at all is the Drafting Team, and that has two representatives from each of the potential chartering organizations, so I'm not sure what group you're talking about that's

open. There were a number of open meetings at ICANN meetings over the last year that gave direction to the charter Writing Group, so there were several open meetings at ICANN meetings, and that input was all put together. There was also a comment period that was issues, so there was a lot of input from the community into the process.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan, and I have a handful of questions. The first one being, which are the chartering organizations that are expected to charter or co-charter this? Is the GAC, and are the ASO expected to charter this as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: I cannot speak for any of them if they will ultimately charter or not. There has been participation from I believe all of those groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'm not 100% sure of – I would be rather surprised if the GAC, for instance, did not act as one of the chartering groups, but that's clearly up to them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks, Alan. So second, I note the membership criteria having members, participants and observers, and I note in the observers that they can read the mailing list on a read-only basis, but they're not allowed to attend the CCWG meetings. I'm not quite sure whether that applies to not being able to listen in on calls, or whether that just applies to face-to-face CCWG meetings. Perhaps that should be noted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Those are the rules that we're using in general these days. I'm not sure how one prohibits someone from joining a meeting which is effectively a listen-only. You can dial into Adobe Connect if you can find out the code, which is not a real major secret. The phone lines tend to be open, but the rules are identical to what we are using for other groups at this point, so that certainly is the intent of going forward on this one. But if that's problematic, then certainly, you can raise that. I will point out there was significant discussion about how far the conflict of interest issue goes into the CCWG itself. Not the body that's going to be making the allocations, but CCWG.

Clearly, it will be possible for someone to participate in the CCWG campaign for certain rules associated with allocation, which will put them at an advantage in later applying for anything. And we resisted putting rules on who could participate in the CCWG. That would be a radical departure from what we have now done, of having open participation. I use the lowercase P. But we will have a very strong declaration of what your interests might be as far as you best know, but we will not be prohibiting people from participating because of some future action they may take later on.

So it's a messy situation, but we did descend the current rules and not add more restrictions to it than were being pushed for by a number of people. I'm not sure if that addresses the issue or not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks, Alan. That certainly explained it. And thirdly, my third question on this is whether this charter follows the recommendations of the Cross-Community Working Group on Cross-Community Working Groups.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was certainly factored in and used as the base. The current charter that had gone out to comment at the time we were working on this charter was used as the base, not presuming that everything would be adopted, but potentially using it as the best wisdom we had at the time. I can't speak to how closely it adheres to it based on the changes that that group may have made, and the changes that we may have had to make because of the nature of the beast we're creating. But yes, it was factored in and considered.

Any further questions? Thank you very much, and as I said, I do appreciate if anyone can look at it and get back to me and to the ALAC as a whole because if we're going to make any suggestions, it's going to have to be agreed to by the ALAC, not just a single person.

If you have any comments, please send them to me and to the list and I would appreciate some quick timing on that. I apologize for dropping the ball on this one.

Next agenda item is a very short one. We have been talking about ALAC metrics for a long time. Other things keep on getting in the way. I have asked staff to be able to put a wiki page up moderately quickly, which will give the following metrics: they're not all the ones we talked about, but they're the ones that I think are the most interesting and easiest to collect, and specifically, we'll be looking at ALAC and AC/SO liaison attendance at ALAC meetings, regional leaders and regional ALAC members' – the three regional ALAC members, including the NomCom appointee – attendance at RALO meetings, and then attendance for all of those people at At-Large-wide webinars and other meetings that we hold periodically.

And lastly, voting records for ALAC members. We will have those up moderately soon. It's unfortunate we didn't get it up earlier in the ICANN year, but it will be up before Hyderabad, and we will, for next year, be publishing it on a regular, month-by-month basis.

Any questions on that? These are all things, by the way, not that are being discussed by the Metrics Group, which is in [inaudible] at this point. These are all within the ALAC Rules of Procedure, they're currently there and they're currently mandated by the Rules of Procedure, so we're just following the rules on that.

Tijani, and then Judith.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. One moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, I took the telephone, because the interpreters prefer the telephone line. I'd like to ask, Alan, what is the result of that? Shall be any result of it, if we – yes, of course we will record it, we'll publish it perhaps among us, but what would be the result? Shall be any follow-up? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we're going to have to base that on the results. In theory, the ALAC could look at the results and say someone is such a bad ALAC member that we want to get rid of them. I can't imagine the ALAC doing that, but that's certainly something that could be done. The results might be considered by a RALO in reappointing people. The results might be considered by the various people to say, "I need to change my habits." I personally may say, "I want to attend fewer meetings, I'm attending too many" based on the results.

So individuals may change what they do. Various groups may take action based on the results, if they are surprised by what they show. I'm not going to predict that, all I'm saying is we have been mandated to do this, we have been talking about it, and it's time that we actually did something. There are certainly more statistics that we might want rather than this, and I've identified the ones that we can gather with a moderate amount of staff time and present in ways that are not totally confusing. So I don't think there are any more nefarious reasons for it than that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I'm wondering why we don't have involvement in working groups, or attendance at working groups. We have a number of these At-Large Working Groups, and I think we need to also collect the metrics on those, and try to get more people active in those, and maybe – I know in the [TTS] we are working on trying to put out an outreach [inaudible] to get more people to join our group and become active, so I'm just wondering why that was not considered for [gathering] those metrics.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, what we're doing right now is a makeup job, because we have been talking about this for a long time and not doing anything. We collect all those statistics. I can send you a spreadsheet which has everything in it, and it is so large and so sparsely populated because various different people go to different groups, that it has all the information, but you will not glean a lot of – you will get a lot of data, but not a lot of information from it. We're going to do first the things that we can do quickly and present in a meaningful way.

Participation in working groups by all people is something we could present. I'm not sure what the value is. Participation of the ALAC

members and regional leaders in groups we can certainly also note. So there's a lot of work to be done. If you're volunteering to work on helping to come up with ways to present this data in meaningful ways, you'll be accepted. So there's nothing nefarious, we're just trying to do quickly what we can do quickly.

Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Good move. I was just wondering if the people who listen to the recording are taken into account. My second point is that there is a difference between people who skip the vote for a reason and the ones who forget to vote. I know it's difficult to take this into account, but I am sure that you understand what I mean here and something maybe useful in the future. But first, go ahead with all that, it's a good move. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We are trying to have abstain on all votes that matter, where it's applicable. I know you, in at least one case, did not vote because there was no abstain and you would have preferred that. When we publish this, if we catch one that says you didn't vote, but you didn't vote for a reason and you published that reason, then let us know and we'll adjust the tallies. There are not many cases like that, but we will factor it in when we have not included an abstain as we have not in the past on a few cases.

Dave, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Just to also second Judith's comment that I think involvement in working groups should also be tracked, but as someone who has been involved in metrics, I'll be interested in also looking to see how the various statistics can be compiled and presented, so I guess I'm volunteering for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. if staff can note the two volunteers when we go on to the next phase, and certainly, when you see what we have right now, comment on it. We track everything. There's no question about tracking. The only question is, can we present it? And right now, we're doing this at a busy time of the year, but I think it's really important going into Hyderabad to have it before the end of the year. So we are doing what we can right now, and we will continue to enhance it, but tracking is not the question. We do have spreadsheets with everything in it, but it's not very meaningful or useful.

And I don't see any more hands on this, therefore, we will go on to the next item, and we are, at this point, running a little bit late, but not a lot.

The next one is Liaison Selections. I will simply note that the call went out last week. We have had very few nominations, either self-nominations or nominations by other people. There were comments in the last selection process – not for liaisons, because we did it a different way – but there was a demand for liaisons that we have an open process, so I'm assuming people will want to participate. We look

forward to it. Let's get any nominations in, but remember, these are liaison nominations. There are specific qualities or requirements for these positions and they will be honored and addressed by both the Appointee Selection Committee and the ALAC, should the ALAC end up having any [inaudible] to vote on.

You'll note that in the past, the previous Selection Committees in many cases have made a single recommendation to the ALAC. That's certainly how we have done things like the ATRTs and various other groups, or the committee may feel it has multiple candidates that it wants to present to the ALAC, and the ALAC will then make a choice. That's up to the Selection Committee.

So if there are any questions on that, I'll remind you at the last meeting – or I think our last ALAC meeting, or maybe two meetings ago, I don't remember – we decided that the concept of seconding might cause other people so they would not be nominated. We cannot stop people from seconding or supporting a nomination, but we are not recording them on the wiki for the formal record, and seconds are not necessary for any of these positions.

Murray, go ahead.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, thank you, Alan. Just one quick clarification on – maybe Ariel could answer – on the wiki: do the expressions of interest go into the wiki, that link that was posted? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, I don't recall whether the – but maybe someone from staff can tell me, are these expressions of interest or nominees, are they going to the ALAC list publicly, or are they private expressions of interest and nominations? I can't remember how we specified this one. Heidi, or Ariel?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan. Ariel, I'll give it to her. She's put them on – the ones that we received has gone onto a wiki page that only the members of the appointee selection can see.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but where do nominations go? Are they required to go to the ALAC?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think it will be only sent to staff and to you. Let me double check the call, but we've been posting them on the normal 2016 ALAC Selection and Election page. Let me get back to you in just a minute.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's not public.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, but that's where we post them once we receive them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Murray, we'll check into it. I honestly don't remember whether these are public or private ones. In the past, for many selections, we have kept them private, so we're not advertising who it is that is not picked, but I don't recall if there's anything in the Rules of Procedure for liaison selections which make it different.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Okay, sorry, just quickly. I believe the process is to go through the At-Large lists and make the statements, and I've seen a few of those come through that list, so that seems to be the process, and then attach a [COA] to that, so in a sense it's public in the list.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some people have done that, others have done it privately. I don't recall which is required. We'll check on that.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If I remember well, Alan, the mail said that the nomination should go on the list with copy to Alan and the staff, and Heidi, I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: In that case, if it said that, then they are public.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, it's public.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just didn't recall.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, is that a new hand?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. Yes, just as a clarification, [none of the EOIs] are published. They're on a private wiki page for the Selection Committee, but since it's published on the public mailing list, perhaps we don't need to apply view restrictions to that page.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we will probably need to change our procedures. We'll talk after this call. I may have made a bad judgment call when I said they should go on to a private page.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other items on this one? No, seeing nothing. The next item is very short. There will be a call for ALT selections coming out shortly. As you

recall, the ALT is one person per region. Since I've already been named Chair, North America is covered, so we'll be looking for one person for each of the other regions and that will be coming out shortly. And you will recall in the past I was asked to serve notice before the formal call went out and that is what I am doing at this point.

Next item: Wiki Cleanup. Just a very short item. As some of you are aware – or all of you are probably aware – over the years, the wiki has gotten a little bit out of control, that sometimes pages are hung off of less than appropriate ways. Sometimes, similar pages for things in different years are connected in different ways, and we'll be starting a cleanup of that. Ariel will be taking charge of it. it's not a major job, it's not one of her main tasks, but we're going to try to move towards making the wiki a little bit more logical than it is now. If you have any pet peeves of things that have annoyed you, please let her know.

Any other items on that? I don't think so. Next one. The last major item is ICANN 57, and I'll turn it over to Gisella and Heidi. We are a bit short of time, we have only 20 minutes left in the call, so I apologize for that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alright, I'm going to hand it over to Gisella, since she's been doing and excellent job leading this. And I do want to point out just one thing before I hand it over. Please note the red on the agenda, that this is for Gisella and all of you, because we really need your input to be able to create the meeting that is the best for all of you. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: When you say red, do you mean the background red or the writing in red?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The color is in red. On the agenda, you'll see that it says, "All," which we had never used before, but we thought that this was very important, that this item needs all of your inputs, please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Heidi. Alan, just the red is on the actual wiki agenda page, not on what's seen on the screen now. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, got it. I thought you were highlighting the coffee breaks and lunch.

GISELLA GRUBER: No.

GISELLA GRUBER: No, [inaudible] absolutely critical, but lunch is in green, because no one is going to have much time to have lunch. So that is green. Lots of colors.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Before Gisella starts, I'll simply note that the first days of meetings are going to be very problematic. The first day is one of the two days for At-Large leadership meetings. It is problematic this time

because two critical GNSO PDPs will be meeting: one in the morning, one in the afternoon, the RDS and the new gTLD. They are likely to be very substantive discussions. And people who are participating in those PDPs probably should be involved, but that means scheduling things in the ALAC At-Large meetings, which are perhaps less than crucial, and that's going to be difficult to find enough. So it's a constraint that is going to be really serious this time and we're not quite sure – and we won't know exactly what the details are until the high interest topics are announced, but it's going to be really difficult to get a schedule that works for everyone, so we're all going to have to be adjusting somewhat as we go forward.

Thank you, turning it over back to you, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan, Gisella here. I'll let everyone look on the screen. I've given sync rights, so that you can go through the agenda. I'm just going to do a brief overview. All the meeting forms have been submitted. We have still got an outreach session with NextGen to place, but it is very important at this stage, on Tuesday, the 27th of September, that we still don't know the high interest topics that are going to be placed in the afternoon session, which, against that, have got TBC. Sorry, not in the last two on Monday.

So TBC basically meaning that we are allowed to schedule meetings against the high interest topics, not like in Helsinki at the policy forum. However, until the topics are released, we're not going to be able to schedule anything, and there may be a little bit of a last minute shuffle

around to be able to accommodate especially the outreach session with NextGen.

The color coding on here is yellow for ALAC, we have a pink for the RALO meetings, blue for working group meetings. Over the lunch period, we've got the APRALO ALS capacity building sessions for four days, running from Saturday through to Tuesday, and then we also have an ALT session with the CSG as well as the Registry Stakeholder Group, and an ALT meeting on the last Wednesday.

Again, I'm not going to spend much more time going through this. What we need to work on now are the agendas for not only the At-Large leadership working sessions, but also for the last day, which his Wednesday, the 9th of November, for the RALO development session, as well as the ALAC development session. Every Chair of a working group or RALO leader will be receiving an e-mail now with the confirmed time of their meeting, requesting agendas on time so that we can send them off and have them translated.

We have meetings with the ccNSO, with the GAC, and with the ALAC Board, and this time, ccNSO meeting has actually been put in as a separate meeting, allowing us to focus, and we've put in for 90 minutes, but we will no doubt only need 60. And I'm open to any questions.

Sorry, just one last thing. On Tuesday, the 8th of November, you also have – which is new on the schedule – the APAC space at ICANN 57, which is a 90-minute session, and I heard earlier on from Vanda that I believe the LAC Space session is on Friday, the 4th, which I will also add to our schedule. I wasn't aware of the timing, I was waiting to hear

back. And at the bottom of each day, if there is a social event, it will be in pink. Open to any questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see Judith in the queue, but I have a question first. There was supposed to be a survey going out to At-Large leadership to the ALAC list on what topics do people want to cover and what groups do we want to visit? I haven't seen that. Did I miss it, or has it not gone out yet?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. It's my fault, it will be going out today. Ariel and I did not connect yesterday, so we will do that this morning, my time, and it will go out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, thank you. And with a short deadline, I hope we're filling in. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I noticed that the ALT is having their meeting at the same time as the RALO development session. Does that mean that these people will not be available, will not be at the RALO development session, or what does that mean?

ALAN GREENBERG:	The RALO development session is for RALO leaders, period, so I don't think there's any overlap. Unless I'm missing someone, I don't think there's any overlap.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Correct. And just to let the RALO leaders who are on this call know that the next Secretariat meeting will be moving forward with the development of that agenda. Thank you.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Secretariat meeting at the ICANN meeting? I didn't see one.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	No, it's being scheduled now.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Teleconference.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	It will be a teleconference.
ALAN GREENBERG:	In terms of the At-Large development session, that also is something we have to work on. I have been asking for input, and we haven't gotten any. If there are any volunteers who want to work actively on helping to put that together, then please be known. At this point, it is me, Heidi and Cheryl who have expressed interest and are willing to participate in

this. If anyone else would like to have their hand in, please let us know, and we will do that quickly.

We are starting to run out of time. Anything else? Gisella? Any other issues on your section A?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, thank you. No, and the only small issue at this stage is the high interest topics, which as soon as they're released, I'm sure everyone will be aware of them, and again, as we said, if we need to do a little bit of shuffling around meetings, the team are aware of the fact that some of our meetings are dependent on – that is afternoon sessions – whether we can have any meetings running against them or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, thank you. Sébastien, you have your hand up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. I wanted to know in all this proposal, what is fixed, and what could change? I guess that the opening of the place and the closing of the place is something fixed, but except that, can we know what is fixed or what can be changed before or during?

ALAN GREENBERG: The block schedule is effectively fixed right now. Yes, if there are exceptional circumstances, we can attempt to do scheduling changes. So the block schedule, which essentially says when the rooms are

occupied, when we have translation, when we have technical services, it's fixed then as according to the schedule. The exception to that is against the high interest topics, where we have tentatively scheduled things which may cancel if the high interest topic is something that we think in fact will be high interest to all of At-Large, or a large part of it. The schedules within the meetings are completely flexible at this point, we have not set those, but everything else at this point is to some extent cast in concrete unless there is some really crucial, real major reason why it has to change. Did you have anything specifically in mind, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, I have not something specific in mind, but you know that there's discussion about what is the last day of the meeting set for and who will be supposed to be there and participate, and I think that something will need to be fixed by ICANN meeting start. I have nothing concrete.

ALAN GREENBERG: To make it clear to everyone else, the original meeting strategy said the last day is not really a full meeting day, but is for integration of new groups and things like that. That's a very small percentage of the total attendee mass at an ICANN meeting, a very small percentage. We have scheduled it according to those rules, as I believe the GNSO has, so we are scheduling no public meetings on the last Friday.

On the other hand, ICANN is advertising the last day of the meeting as the 9th. The closing cocktail is at the end of the 9th. That is presuming that all the rest of the attendees are wandering around the halls, doing

something on the 9th. It remains to be seen when we publish the schedule how many things there will be for those people. We may end up being accused of misleading advertising, because the formal public meeting may end up stopping on the 8th.

On the other hand, there may be some interesting meetings for people who are not following the schedule. This is far from clear at this point, but from At-Large, it is very clear that return date for ongoing At-Large leaders – that is people who are either RALO leaders or ALAC members out for the following year, their departure date is the 10th. The departure date for other people is the 9th, so we have adhered to that fully. How that will map out for the rest of the community is going to be really interesting. We don't know at this point.

I'll point out there are other variations. You'll note that we have lunch meetings most of the time. Lunch is being provided by the Indian government, we do not know the format. We are presuming we will be able to run in, get food and get back to the rooms, and that the distances and the rules about carrying food and access to the food quickly will all allow this. We don't know that for a fact. So lots of things still up in the air.

Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. My point of view is that the last cocktail needs to move to the previous day, but we will see what happens then to be sure. All the 9th is for ALAC, RALO, ALT meeting. It's just for the new

ones, for the ones who will take the seat at Hyderabad and will be going on for the next months or years.

ALAN GREENBERG: All of the Wednesday the 9th sessions are for people who, as of the end of the meeting, are RALO leaders, ALAC members, liaisons.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We of course have a potential problem that if someone becomes a liaison – because that's the only group that's not known at this point – if they become a liaison, they may already have been scheduled travel to leave on that day. That's a problem we'll have to deal with if it comes.

                         Next, anyone else? Gisella, do you have anything else for item 16 A?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, just to add that the shuttles will be ending at 8:10 in the evening. We haven't had exact shuttle rotations yet, but I do believe that they will be leaving each hotel without doing the round robin as they did in Dublin, and a reminder that none of the hotels are in walking distance, except for the Novotel at the venue, so there will be no alternative then to take the shuttle or potentially a taxi. And the opening time – the meetings team have asked us not to start before 8:30, just due to the

shuttle times and to allow people time to get to the venue on time and not have an empty meeting room for the sessions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And of course, we will have extremely tight security getting into the venue.

GISELLA GRUBER: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we can safely predict that at least on the first few days, we will have chaos. If we don't, let's all be pleased, but certainly, I'm not presuming there will not be.

Last item on this item – and we're getting within five minutes of the end of the meeting – is Travel and Visas. For anyone on this meeting, is there anybody here who does not have their travel arrangements and does not have their visa? I don't need a public announcement of it, but if you do not have your visa or are reasonably assured of getting it, or you have not arranged your travel yet, please contact staff and let them know. Don't presume that there is discussion with Constituency Travel and everyone knows your situation. So take positive action to let people know that you're still having a problem, if you're not sure that they know that is the case. Our staff do not arrange travel, but we need to know if there are any issues.

I see Tijani has his hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Alan, it is known and predicted that my visa and my travel arrangements are not done, because the embassy here told me – and repeated it several times, even if I insist – they said they can not give me more than one month validity visa, and this validity will start immediately when I take it on my passport.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, we know your situation, we know Cheryl is still having a situation. If there is anyone who is not absolutely sure that staff is aware of a problem, let them know.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, I wanted to also say that since the visa is still an issue, no travel arrangement can be done, because Constituency Travel will not buy the ticket and will not make the hotel firm reservation if you don't have the visa. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that is the current rules. That's why I want staff to know how many people are still in that situation. We can change rules, or get them to try to change if we know that is an issue with some people. So I just want to make sure everyone – I don't want to find out afterwards, as I do almost every year, that someone was having trouble for two months but didn't tell anybody other than Constituency Travel. That is what I'm trying to protect against.

For staff, if we can please get in touch with any ALAC members or regional leaders who are not on this meeting, and confirm what their status is, I would appreciate that.

Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Alan, for asking this question. I think it's a very important issue, and that's good that it's publicly asked for everybody to get to the staff to get the situation. And I have done it, and it's okay, I just wanted to say that At-Large staff is not organizing the meeting, but they can streamline the process and they have done it for me, and I want to thank them. It's not yet done, but it's going in the right direction for my issue.

And the last point I want to make is that Tijani says there are some rules. It seems that maybe the rules didn't apply to all the same, and I don't know if it needs to be publicly recorded, but I have my travel arrangement and not my visa yet. I hope that the visa will come, it would be better for everybody, but then I am not sure that there are

rules that maybe are not the same, or they are not handled the same to everybody. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Constituency Travel was pretty clear: for countries where the people almost always get visas, they are arranging travel ahead of time. For countries where it is more questionable, they are not. We might be able to change that position, but that is where it is. Now, for India, the most unsuspecting people are not getting visas and having them refused, so ICANN might be hurt by that. They may end up having bought tickets for some people who they were sure would get a visa, and don't. That's life, part of the cost of doing business.

I'm told we skipped one thing, that is the questions for the Board under the ICANN 57 schedule, that is 16 A IV. At this point, we are having a face-to-face meeting with the Board. Not like the last meeting, but this is, again, some sort of roundtable. We have asked for, at the very least, all of the ALAC members present to be at the table. I do not know how many people the Board will have at the table. But we do need – they will be raising questions of their own, so we don't have to fill up the hour, but we do need to identify anything that we want to raise with the Board, so please, if you don't have anything now, let us know as soon as possible. We will suddenly get a deadline where we have to submit these.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Only to note that people from Tunisia are not in the case of those who have problems of getting visa. I have a ten-year visa for the U.S., I have a three-year Schengen visa, I have never been refused a request for a visa, so I don't know why my travel arrangement is not done. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then may I suggest you ask Joseph, could he make arrangements based on this history?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I will do, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Living in Africa puts a stigma on you, you should be aware of that by now. It may not be fair, but it does come with the territory I'm afraid. Let Joseph know your history, and hopefully, he can adjust that. That's why I said there is possibility for changing some of these relatively informal, undocumented rules.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Last call for any comments, Any Other Business. Hearing nothing, seeing nothing. The meeting is three minutes over, for which I apologize, and the meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Alan. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: The meeting is now adjourned. You will now be disconnected. Thank you very much for your participation, and have a lovely rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]