GISELLA GRUBER:	…thanks everyone, and good in the middle of the night for Maureen. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team meeting on Friday the 16th of September at 12 UTC.
	On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Sandra Hoferichter, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Julie Hammer, Yrjö Länsipuro, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.
	We have apologies for León Sanchez.
	From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yeşim Nazlar, and myself, Gisella Gruber.
	We are still trying to get hold of Tijani Ben Jemaa, and I will let you know as soon as he comes online.
	And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. The first item on our agenda, I don't really have any welcome or instructions on introductions. I'm not quite sure why we need that anymore for this meeting. Review of any ALT items. Is Heidi with us?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	I am. Hi all. I've just put the link into the chat, and I'll [inaudible], three have been completed, and one, which was for you to drop a set of

criteria, Olivier can give us the draft to you. That is in progress, apologies for the delay. And that should be making quick headway today. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good, sort of late.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I know. Thank you. Over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The next item is policy, and over to Ariel, assuming she's on the line. She is.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Alan. This is Ariel Liang for the record. So for the policy, we only have one item in the pipeline that needs some action. It's mainly for Alan. It's about the input request from the subsequent procedures working group, and that's all. So Alan, it's just pending your action.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And that one, I'm actually waiting for something from Cheryl on to quickly review what Holly and I put together, unless I missed it when you sent it back.

Is Cheryl on the line yet?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If you can get a chance.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I haven't done that, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a quick… The responses are all very short, unlike the ones that came in from some people. They tend to reflect our long-term positions. Some of them, perhaps, are a little bit curt. A little bit too short, perhaps. But, see if you find anything offensive. Carlton had one small comment, I don't remember what it is right now, I've got a check, but he did send me something.

But I do… The issue does come up later on the agenda, so we're going to talk about it again. Ariel, I thought there were some new comments open yesterday, or so, did they not?

ARIEL LIANG: Let me double check, because I just woke up. [LAUGHTER]

ALAN GREENBERG: If none of you [inaudible], look at it and we'll come back to it later.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Do you want me to just quickly talk about it? The proposal?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, it's a new public comment on proposals for a Georgian script label generating rules. [Inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, that's a non-issue for us. We don't comment on those.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right, next item is number five on CCWG accountability work stream two issues. I don't think there are any at this point. We will be looking at, and you'll see a survey in the next hour, day, on what do we cover in Hyderabad. I'm assuming we'll have either a single session on all of the work stream two, or perhaps individual sessions on some of them, if we think it warrants direct focus of the ALAC and At-Large leadership.

I don't think we have anything else that explicitly needs to be talked about that. I see Olivier has his hand up, sorry I missed it. I'm working

on two different computers today, so I'm looking in two directions, and if I miss a hand, just let me know.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And that's fine, I just put my hand up so you were very quick on the trigger. I was going to mention, you can't anticipate, you can't go any faster than if I put it up. So, I was just going to say, the IANA issues working group that deals with all of this, we're restarting it. We've got a Doodle for next week, and there is also a call for more members, because obviously the work stream two issues have brought a whole lot of new things.

So, we're kind of moving off IANA stewardship transition and moving on into ICANN accountability work stream two. Hopefully, we'll get some more members that will be able to join this group, and provide a good soundboard for those people who are directly involved in work stream two activities.

I have received a question from staff on whether we would want to have a face to face meeting in Singapore. But as you just mentioned, you think that it should be like for everyone, basically, to be in that part.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so, because at some point, you know, things are going to come back to the ALAC, so we have to start talking about where things are at this point. And by then, in several of the subgroups, we should have made some substantial progress, I think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND   Okay. So that's fine with me, perfect. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: …some other name?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, the mailing list itself is still called that. Changing the mailing list, we then would have to create a new mailing list, and we risk losing the archives and stuff of the other one, so we could keep the same mailing name, but we can certainly change the name of the working group, if you want.

ALAN GREENBERG: The mailing list for this group is still ex-com.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mailing list for the IANA issues group, I'm talking about.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. Mailing list for this group, the ALT, is still ex-com. We have an established standard of how we do this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, okay. That's fine, yeah. Call it one thing and keep it one thing, and change the name. I mean, change the name but keep the same list. Perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: Rebranding. The corporation name may not change, but the name we use in public will.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Anything else anyone wants to…? We have some hands up. Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Alan. Julie Hammer speaking. Just for the [I might share?] with the ALT, that I've just retained from the SSAC to their workshop in Washington, and we actually spent more than a couple of hours going through and not dating the SSAC on what's happening in work stream two. And in particular, I thought you'd be interested to hear that I've prepared and [inaudible] a fairly extensive discussion on the issue of diversity, which is a work stream two subgroup that I'm keeping a particularly close eye on.

And we ended up putting some thoughts down on paper, which, as yet, has really been [inaudible] internal to the SSAC. But, we've put down

EN

some thoughts on why is diversity relevant and important to the SSAC, and whether the particular attributes of diversity that we feel are of differing levels of importance, and we identified one primary factor, a number of secondary factors, and then we listed some other factors of attributes of diversity that are of less than important.

So we've sort of divided them into three groups. So it was interesting that we had a really good discussion on that which was a bit of a surprise because, you know, to be honest, a lot of the SSAC members really don't like talking about anything but technical issues, but I was really happy with the outcome.

So just thought you might be interested to hear that happened.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you share some of the higher priority ones? Were there any commitments that they were going to stay higher priority?

JULIE HAMMER: The number one priority is expertise, and that could be both technical or non-technical expertise. Now, going on with [inaudible], haven't got it right in front of me, but some of the other… The secondary priority, like [inaudible] that will come into play with expertise is ticked off, background, that is the sector that the person might come from, whether it's in industry, academia, law enforcement, that sort of background is a diversity issue that's relevant.

What stakeholder background they come from is also relevant. It's important to have a spread of background there. Gender is important,

geographic diversity is important, and language diversity is important. I think I've covered them all.

And then, we actually said issues that are really not of any great importance to SSAC are things like orientation, you know, those sorts of things. Education it's left… That sort of thing is really, doesn't come into play.

ALAN GREENBERG: Interesting. Several of the ones you put right at the top, are things that are often either completed ignored in diversity, and you know, industry and where you come from. It's something we clearly have in ICANN, and yet, that is discounted. And of course, expertise, it's usually diversity versus expertise, not considering expertise as a diversity.

So I look forward to seeing that. That's good.

Next item, Hyderabad. No, yes, ICANN 57. And I'll turn that one over to Heidi. It says me, but I'm not the point person.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's going to be both, but Gisella first. This is Heidi.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan, thank you Heidi. This is Gisella. I sent, I'm sorry for the delay in sending it. It's really a work in progress, this Hyderabad schedule, due to the fact that we're going to have high interest topics,

or they have not been finalized. But it may be only me, but I have an echo on the line.

So, the final schedule will be decided next week, and we will no doubt need to have met possibly a [inaudible] next week, so maybe we can decide on this one, if you'd like, to have one or if Alan, Heidi, and myself can do it, as León will be on holiday, and he has had some input in it so far.

Sorry, do you all hear an echo?

ALAN GREENBERG: We do. [CROSSTALK]

I'm on speaker phone, if it's annoying anyone, let me know.

GISELLA GRUBER: Let me just try something.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's now silent.

GISELLA GRUBER: Is that any better?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

GISELLA GRUBER: There we go. I need to speak through my computer, not through my telephone. Sorry, that sort of thing, we may need to have a call next week, if you all think it would be useful, or we can, as far as… We'll see how far the discussion has come today, and maybe we can just set it for Alan for next week.

The high interest topics have been sent out to SO, AC, SG chairs, etc., to make a selection in which ones are going to be the final topics for the afternoon session. And once we know that, we'll know whether we can schedule any parallel meetings against the high interest topic sessions in the afternoon.

I've sent around the Excel spreadsheet, the draft schedule. Lots of colors, lots of little notes on it. All of the notes are for me, but all of the colors are just to have a quick glance of what's happening. And if you'd like to open that up on your own computers, I will share it now on the Adobe Connect, but I have to say, it's probably much easier looking at this on your own computers.

If we [inaudible] because we haven't been through this for a while, I'm just going to run this through the days as it stands now, give you a brief overview, then give you a brief overview of the RALOs who have decided to meet, the working groups that have been decided so far, and any social events, and then open for discussion.

So if you'll just bear with me. You've all got the document open, you can see it on Adobe Connect. I'm going to give you synch rights, just please increase the viewing size, or look on your computer. If we start

on Thursday the 3rd of November, we've got the At-Large leadership working session for two days, which will usually be Saturday and Sunday. We're a little bit slow at this meeting because it starts on a Thursday and ends on a Wednesday, as opposed to starting on a Saturday and ending on a Friday.

The first working group meeting of the Hyderabad meeting will be the At-Large review working party on the Thursday during the lunch break. Now, before anyone asks about the lunch break, the latest news since yesterday, is that the sponsored lunch… What we know at this stage is that there will be a sponsored lunch by the hosts. We're not sure yet of the format, whether it's going to be a boxed lunch, whether it's going to be a buffet, where it's going to be set up, etc.

What we're working on at the moment is for the first half an hour for the lunch break, 12:15 to 12:45, to use that time for people to be able to go and get their lunch, for either of the sponsored lunch, which I think everyone will be doing, there will also be outlets to buy sandwiches in the conference hall. And then to be able to come back to the meeting room to have a meeting.

We're 90% sure that we'll be able to bring the sponsored food into the meeting rooms, but I have been told that we can buy a sandwich and bring them into the meeting rooms. Hence, using the lunchtime sessions, because have early morning sessions in Hyderabad, I feel we're going to have empty rooms due to the fact that all of the hotels, except for the [inaudible] hotel, are 30 to 40 minute shuttle, and in the morning, it could probably lead to an hour.

We saw what happened in Dublin, and there is no option to walk or to cycle to the venue. Back to the schedule. We've got the full day on Thursday with the At-Large review working party meeting over the lunch. Friday, again, a full day, with a tentative Satish lunch, that is a meeting that he has requested for himself.

At the end of the day, we've got the GAC and the Board meeting. Now, Alan told me yesterday…

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, can you go over that again? What about Satish?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Satish, I put that meeting in there. Satish has requested a meeting, and the topic is schools of internet. It is not only limited to the APAC region, but it is open to everyone who would like to attend. The topic is schools of internet. Hence it being on our schedule.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

GISELLA GRUBER: But it's not an ALAC meeting. When we get to the end of the day, we've got, we've secured a while back with the ccNSO support staff, the ALAC and ccNSO meeting, which is down for an hour and a half. It's not going to be an hour and a half. We've just currently used that slot because of the block times on the schedule. In the meantime, we've been notified

that the GAC and Board meeting is part one, is likely to be held from 17 to 18:00.

So what we've done in the meantime is gone back to the ccNSO support staff and asked them whether we could have the meeting earlier on the Friday or at any other time. I've been notified that the ccNSO Council are arriving on the Friday, they will be there only for meetings as of Friday the fourth, so we can't have it on the Thursday instead. It's not an option.

That's for work in progress. And you may have noticed on the schedule that we have a second GAC and Board meeting, which is on Wednesday the 9th of November, the last day, from 11 to 12:15. That will be to run through the, for the GAC and Board to run through the communique.

I know that Alan has some more information on those two meetings. Alan, would you like to share your information?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, the rationale is that... Typically what has happened at ICANN meetings is towards the end of the meeting, the GAC issues their communique, and after that, the Board would just work in silence, essentially trying to figure out what it is they meant. This time around, after Helsinki, they actually had a teleconference, I believe, to try to go, to try to make sure the Board understood the implications of some of the communique issues.

And this meeting is to address that in a more formal and open way, that is to have an opportunity for the board to ask questions or the GAC to

elaborate on what the communique says. So it's essentially... The first meeting is the standard one, the second one is a follow-up on the communique to make sure that there is a clear understanding.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you for that, Alan. And Tijani, this is Gisella here. And Tijani has just joined the Adobe Connect room. [CROSSTALK] That evening we've got the SO AC RALO dinners with [inaudible]. We're waiting on details. We now we go on to the rest of the week, which is the [inaudible] on Saturday. We've got a nonconsistency [inaudible] slot after that.

Again, because of the early morning issues we're going to have in Hyderabad, the APRALO ALS capacity building sessions are going to be held during the lunch break on the Saturday, Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday. So we've put that in for an hour on those days. We can run meetings parallel to that.

Anyone who is not involved in that capacity building session, we've got, you've seen on the schedule, I've put little 60 minute slots, just to say that we can keep those in mind, but I think again, due to the length of the days running from 9 to 6:30, the transfer times, which are probably going to be anywhere up to an hour each way, I think that having a good lunch break will probably be the best solution at this stage.

The afternoon high interest topic has not yet been confirmed, so we haven't scheduled anything parallel to those. And then we've got the part one of the ICANN public forum at the end of Saturday. That day we have the gala. Again, details to be confirmed probably mid-October.

Going on to Sunday. We have the… I know it's not the current, exact title of the working group, but it's the accessibility working group. I know that Ariel has had contact with Cheryl with regards to the duration as an action item in June status, that we wanted a meeting a little longer than usual.

So I've currently got a two-hour slot in there. APRALO monthly meeting, again the lunch break with the capacity building session. In the afternoon, we've got our GAC and ALAC meeting, which is one hour. And then two high interest topics, again, nothing scheduled parallel to those.

And where the gray boxes are on the schedule, that means those are non-conflicting slots, so nothing can be scheduled at the same time as those. Going on to Monday, we've discussed with Alan, we're either going to have an ALT meeting from 8 to 9:30, or 8:30 to 9:30, or depending on how the schedule develops, we could also have an At-Large leadership working session, if more time is needed for any of the topics.

My thinking behind this is I'm just going to put it in an At-Large leadership working session for now, that means that we've got interpretation as back-up, should we need it. It's easier to cancel something than to try and get it on the schedule. ALAC and Board meeting is Monday from 9:45 to 10:45.

We have a… That, then, is a free morning slot where we can put a working group, or any other meeting we need. We've got the [inaudible] in session at lunchtime again, and running parallel to that, so

I'm going to put it into the box next to it, is the ALT and CFG meeting that Olivier has been following-up with Tony Helm. So we've put that there, and we've confirmed it with GNSO support staff. After the Afri-Can meeting in the afternoon, currently I'm thinking, technology taskforce meeting, not too much of an overlap of attendees, and I've also looked at the attendance over the past few meetings.

So, AFRALO went [inaudible] just on, for that session. And high interest topics in the afternoon. Again, so to be confirmed whether we can use those slots. Second last day is Tuesday, annual general meeting, nothing to be scheduled parallel with that. Public forum, capacity building session, public forum part two.

I've [inaudible] put the joint BCEC DNS CC meeting there, for 90 minutes. We've got quite a few of the members who will be in Hyderabad, in person. At then at the end of the day, we've got NARALO yearend review. It is not a monthly NARALO meeting, and it's similar to what they had in Helsinki, which is just an overview of what NARALO has done in the year.

Wednesday we've got the RALO development session in the morning and the ALAC development session in the afternoon. What we've done there is, we may have an ALT running, meeting running parallel with the RALO development session. The GAC and Board meeting is the one that Alan referred to, which would be the discussion of the communique between the GAC and the Board.

Currently, nothing scheduled over the lunch break. We'll see whether the capacity building sessions meeting… Oh no, we won't see anything

there because they would have left. The ALAC development session is in the afternoon. And I've just seen if we need any more time for either the RALO development, or the ALAC development session, we can use the lunch break, because we've got a one-and-a-half-hour lunch break there.

And we've decided to end the ALAC development session at 5:30, even though the cocktail starts at 5, the closing cocktail. We're going to miss the first 30 minutes of the cocktail. Don't worry, there will be more than enough food and drink. We'll make sure of that. We'll tell them you're arriving late.

So, [inaudible] schedule still, is the AOP with the registry stakeholder group. [Inaudible] and I are still trying to get in on their schedule. Working groups, I've still got to take the capacity building [inaudible] the…

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, you're cutting out badly now. Or maybe we've lost you all together.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We've lost her completely.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Alan, this is Heidi. We're working with Gisella and getting her back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry for the delay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we're doing okay with time at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. This is Heidi again. And she is not responding to Skype.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, dear.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, I'm here. Did you lose me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We did…

ALAN GREENBERG: We now have that echo from you, but you're back again.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry about that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: The last we heard was basically you were just starting the meetings that are still to be scheduled.

GISELLA GRUBER: Oh, sorry about that. Gee, I've been rattling along. Okay. Meetings still to be scheduled. I'm working with Glenn on the ALT with the registry stakeholder group, the meeting that Olivier setup before. We've got working groups, the capacity building working group, the outreach subcommittee, the public interest working group, and yes, other ones I've really tentatively put on our schedule.

Coming back to the main schedule, I forgot to say that on Sunday the 6th of November, 18:30 to 20:00 we've got the showcase penciled in. And then a question was on the last day, which is the Wednesday, the 9th of November, to have an ALAC and liaison dinner after the closing cocktail.

I think that if we do that, I need to do a RSVP save the date to see how many people are going to be joining, and then look into logistics because we've got probably two, possibly three, hotels, I've got two hotels between the [inaudible] Hotel and the hotel that all of the ALAC members are staying at.

So the logistics might be a little bit of a nightmare, so just to get a little bit of a feel of thoughts on that. And did you hear, you probably heard this, first 30 minutes of the cocktail. And that is all from me at this stage.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much. We have some hands. I've got about four or five issues to raise, but let's quickly take what the comments are then we'll make sure we cover them as we go ahead. Olivier first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And the question I have is with regards to the 8:00 sessions, which we have here. What time do the busses start at? Would it be at 7? Because in Dublin, the buses didn't start before 7, as far as I can remember, and they… Actually, some did, but they took so much time that the first bus actually started so late, that we couldn't make it to the sessions by the time the bus arrived at the convention center.

And so we ended up walking. And here, I understand that with the amount of lead in the atmosphere that will be flying around, it will be impossible to walk.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, no, walking is not advisable on several different levels. The busses this time, will not be making multiple stops, supposedly, so that part is better, but it's well understood, and we may well have to adjust the schedule, to make sure people actually get there.

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may, just why I took Sunday and Monday, having 8:30 for sure, that's what we discussed, potentially 8:00 subject to the shuttles, and shuttles, we don't know for another couple of weeks, I'd say, because we, in the background I'm trying to get this information, but they don't

have it yet. On the block schedule, the day four and day five, so Sunday and Monday, do actually start at 8:30 for the inter-community SO, AC, ASG, etc. joint meetings with the Board.

So, the main general meetings will be starting at 8:30, hence me putting our meetings at that time as well. I didn't do it on the other days, because the other days I don't have anything on the main schedule starting ahead of time. So I'm fitting in with what was in the block schedule.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, we're going to have to be flexible. Security is probably going to be very, very tight. We don't know how well they're going to be geared up for getting people into the building once they show up at the building. So, there is a lot of variables, as there seems to be at almost every meeting this year, in recent meetings. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. Thank you very much Gisella, for this presentation. I'd like to note that I don't have the link to this block schedule, and it is so small, and I am so old to be able to read what is on it. If there is a link, it would be better for me. And my question, my comment, is that this time, also, I am not saying that you are programming the capacity building working group together with the outreach subcommittee at the same time, which made last time, both rooms more or less empty, or half-empty.

EN

So, if it is possible to avoid this kind of simultaneous meeting which are operating by 10 people. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks Tijani. You should have received the spreadsheet via email. So if you check, you may have it there. [CROSSTALK] I've got a number of things to mention, some of them are just heads up, and some are questions. We need, do we know what formats the Board and AC SO meetings are going to be in this time?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, Gisella here. No, I don't. I'll follow-up with Board support staff.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you please ask, because you know, the number of people we have on that kind of stuff is always a hot issue. [CROSSTALK] Almost surely, we will need some topics, so people should start thinking about that too. Yes Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, so I've heard that it's basically likely to be the same format as we've had in the past, more engagement, etc. I have heard that in addition of questions from the ACs and SOs, the Board will be submitting some questions as well, so [inaudible] for that.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Good, we've asked them to do that in the past, so that will be good. All right. There has been… I was on a call with assorted chairs the other day, and they too have expressed the same concerns I have, that if the Wednesday is the scheduled by at least several of the groups, if not all, for indoctrination and you know, whatever of the incoming ACs SOs, what are the other 2,000 people going to be doing?

And everyone does not seem to know, so at this point, we really don't know if anything is going to be scheduled for the public on the Wednesday, other than the closing cocktail at the end of the day. It remains to be seen. There seems to be a huge discontinuity between what is being publicly advertised as the meeting and then what, you know, the meeting team and the original, you know, new meeting scheduled people have said.

So that's the complete unknown, at this point. I mean, in our case, we're not even, we're saying the people aren't even going to be staying if they're not participating in those things, and but clearly, of all of the people who are paying their own way, they're likely to be doing it based on the public schedule.

And it's going to be interesting. The high interest topics, as Gisella noted, are not a known yet. There is still a process going on to discuss them. I'll be sending something out to the ALT on that very shortly, because I just got a question from staff, but clearly, we're going to have a hard time scheduling our session, not knowing whether we can schedule against things because we don't know what the topics are yet.

EN

So that's something that's going to add to the uncertainty. At this point, we're making room requests and don't know whether we'll use them or not. As Gisella noted, we don't know anything about the lunch, and I suspect that we're not going to know until pretty well close to when we get there.

We're assuming we'll be able to take out lunch from the catered lunch and go to meetings with it, we don't know that for sure. You know, that presupposes, number one, we'll be able to get our food quickly. Number two, we'll be allowed to take it out of the room. And who knows?

And lastly, the first day of meetings overlaps with meetings of the GNSO PDPs on RDFs and new gTLDs. There is a fair number of us that are involved in either one or both of those. That's going to make scheduling them, the first day, which is Thursday I guess, really challenging, because a fair number of key At-Large people are not going to, either are going to miss the GNSO meetings, which is going to be rather unfortunate because it's likely to be substantive discussion at these meetings, or we'll miss the ALAC meetings.

So, not quite sure how that is going to unfold right now. And I think that's all I had. Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani, is that a new hand?

Can anyone hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can hear you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, well I don't know. I may have dropped off. [LAUGHTER]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no, you're there.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Tijani lowered his hand so it was an old hand. All right. Anyone else have anything to raise related to the schedule? As it is, it's going to be a challenge, there are so many unknowns at this point, and some of them I don't think will be cleared up until we actually get on site.

                          How are people doing on visas?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry, it was an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone have any visa issues to raise? I'll give you my saga, but I'll let anyone else go first.

                          No? Okay. At this point, I have convinced the agent in Montreal to submit to the Indian High Commission in Ottawa, my application. I went back yesterday with the same documents that they told me were inadequate two weeks ago, and this time, I wrote out a personal note to them, saying, somebody whispered in my ear that the appropriate

ministry has sent the appropriate document to the High Commission so they're waiting there.

I'm not sure if that's true or not, that is what I was told. So I may have a visa, or you may be running the meeting without me. We'll see. Any other comments on meeting arrangements before we go on to the next agenda item?

Seeing no hands, and I now have to see what the next agenda item is.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Topics for Alan to raise with [inaudible].

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan? [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Good ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Just for on the ICANN 57 and what I brought up, I'm sorry it wasn't the next agenda item. Just with regards to what we're calling the survey, just to get an idea of what people want. What I found was we sent out, I think it was prior to, I think it must have been prior to Dublin, but in any case, we've used Survey Monkey before, but what you have set up was actually just an Excel spreadsheet with [inaudible].

EN

And we're just going to work on what you see on there, on the screen here, is just a guess, [inaudible] topic, yes, no, if you think it's important, etc. And what I've point at the bottom, which we're going to work on it, it's going to come out, it should come out under a survey format, but just to give you an idea is the topics, how you rank them, high, medium, and low, and do you consider this to be a policy topic?

Policy topic, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: When you get the draft ready, when you're finished whatever you're doing right now, send it to the ALT, and get comments from everyone to see what we may have missed.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. [Inaudible] I found it 10 minutes before the end, before we started the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, no, I understand. Just for a heads up, the reason why I asked you, do you consider this a policy discussion is, we've got a lot of complaints last time that we were only doing administrative things, not policy. On the other hand, some people consider things like the CCWG accountability policy, other people consider it administrative. So we're just trying to set the ground rules to make sure what people think, so that we can try to schedule things appropriately.

Anything else on ICANN 57?

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. You'll see on the agenda that there is an item, a sub-item on development session. I have put the link into the chat. And there was, the reason why it was on the agenda is that there was an action item to spend more time on this, during this ALT.

                         So I wanted to raise this with everyone. If you could… Is there any way that we can show the page? And if not, could everyone open that please? I'll just keep talking…

GISELLA GRUBER: I'll get it up, give me a couple of minutes, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's assume people have opened the page, start talking.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So basically, as you will all recall, this is an event that will be on the final day. It is for all ongoing incoming ALAC members, liaisons, and others invited by the ALAC chair. Yes, and it will… The aim is basically to foster cooperation with ALAC, a plan for ongoing and upcoming

EN

projects and activities within the ALAC. And it will be serving somewhat as a team building exercise. There are only a few ones coming in, but I think that will still be [inaudible].

Perhaps a dinner following the event can really be used for that. To note that there was supposed to be an external facilitator, but I have worked on that, and unfortunately, we're not able to get anyone from external or even from another department within ICANN, at least for this one. So we are hoping that some among you might be able to serve as a facilitator or joint facilitators. Or rotating facilitators.

So this is going to be taking place November, that's not correct. [Inaudible], no that is not correct. I'm going to change that. And it's the final day of the night. So what this work stream shows is basically, the format will be a fish bowl technique.

Cheryl, if you want to briefly discuss that in just a moment…

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's not spend time on that right now, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So then, what we need to do is, the official technique is basically the way of rotating the people who are speaking, and the thought was that of 15 or so, 18, that there would be groups of three, rotating between, on different topics. So that slide is a table of topics of discussion, a lead team, objectives and outcomes for each of those.

As you can see then, the [inaudible], there is a list of participants. I have not included, so those are the new ALAC members, continuing and incoming. And then there will be liaisons soon to be determined shortly after the call, and then others on invitation of the ALAC Chair. And that is where we are right now. So basically what we need… Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just to be clear, we are going to be doing a combination of professional development and discussions of issues of interest to the ALAC, perhaps policy, perhaps other things. And Heidi, if you could fix it, it really is not Friday the 4th of November, it's Wednesday the 9th of November.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, apologies for that oversight. Yes, all people who are continuing and incoming will be covered for that day. So yeah, basically what we're looking for are facilitators and policy, and how do we select the topics for discussion? So that's where your ideas are needed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next item on the agenda is, I have a 30 minute call scheduled with the CEO for next week, I believe, early in the week. Much of the talk is going to be taken up with discussing ICANN's new communication

plan, which is not, which doesn't exist yet. And so, I thought this was going to be a discussion of a plan that we've already published, but this is apparently prepped to try and create a new plan.

I have no idea what that content is, or how much of the time will be taken up on it. There may will be an opportunity for other issues to be raised. If anyone has anything they think I should be raising with them, let me know either through this list or privately. Again, it's not clear how much time they'll be, or what the opportunities will be, but if you think there are issues that should be raised at that level, in this timeframe, than please go ahead. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, thank you Holly Raiche for the transcript record. What does he mean by communication? Is it communicating toward the outward community? Is it communication within ourselves? Is it communication…?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have a clue. It's ICANN's new communication program, or plan, or something like that, which is currently, apparently, in design. I have no more knowledge than that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I can't comment then really.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi may have more knowledge, I don't know.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. No, I do not have any input or any information on that. But basically what we're looking at is just one or two items that come from you, to raise with your…

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Next item is the, I think the next item is gTLD rounds. I sent a message out to the ALT. I got a comment from Tijani, which I replied to, and one from Holly. Let me go into the background a little bit. As you know, there was a registry/registrar meeting in Amsterdam prior to, I think prior to Helsinki. There was also some presentations to the Board in Helsinki, informal I think, but nevertheless, all of which said, you said there is going to be rounds.

The original policy said there was going to be something like rounds, or an ongoing ability to get new gTLDs. When we announced the first one, we said there would be others. We're now saying, at best, it's going to happen in 2020, maybe later.   Eight years between rounds is not sufficient.

And there was a particular focus, it's not the only group that is complaining, but the dot brand people are saying, we have set up a situation where there is a structural strategic disadvantage to groups that either didn't apply at the time of the last round, or perhaps, it didn't exist at the time of the last round.

And we are now essentially enforcing a strategic disadvantage for those organizations. It dawned on me, and it's just a thought, because I really haven't thought it through, that of the organizations that… Of the TLDs that were applied for and the process we've gone through, arguably the least controversial, if anyone watched the Senate hearings the other day, there was a counter example to this.

But arguably, the dot brands were the least controversial. They don't tend to be used in ways that will harm consumers, ultimately, at least as far as we understand. They tend to be trademarks, and therefore there is not a conflict on names in most cases. So they tend to be much simpler.

The rules would certainly have to be cleaned up for them, but that's a much smaller job then trying to fix all of the problems. And the question I'm asking is, is there some merit in perhaps having a round for just those? The rationale being, at this point, there seems to be strong pressure, and it's going to grow, to get this done quickly and open up a door again for new applications, one way or the other.

And I'm wondering if taking the pressure off of the dot brands, which is the, one of the probably strongest argument for saying, we need to do it sooner rather than later, may take the pressure off and allow us to do the job properly for all of the other kinds of applications.

I'm just wondering what people think about that. It's different from the position we've taken before, but the reality is, there is lots of pressure right now, and it's going to grow. And I'm really worried that the PDP will end up taking shortcuts to try and end up delivering something by

2018 or even earlier, and we will not do the job properly. And I'm wondering if this is, perhaps, a way of short circuiting that. And just thought I would ask questions. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, Holly Raiche for the transcript records. A couple of things. First of all, I think we still have as our primary position, that we need to see all of the reviews, etc. etc. The reason I'm more comfortable with going dot brand is the sort of issues we raised that were obvious to us, were things like confusingly similar, dot brand doesn't do that. The picks in terms of the confusing nature of it, dot brand doesn't do that.

So I was thinking through the things we've really been upset about, and those seem to be avoided, at least in part by the dot brand, so if we have to go that way, although my presence is not to, if we have to go that way, my preference would be a combination of [inaudible] and brands.

My other concern is, I'd like to do geographically dispersed, but I think that would be problematic in handling. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. You've seen my note on the ALT list. I'm also concerned about the word procedure. The current work with [inaudible] team and the PDP, I understand is going

to generate, and I hope, I'd like to actually find a combination or change to what I'm thinking, but isn't that going to generate a near applicant guidebook by which things will have us be, well, everyone is on the same level, because I thought that was the aim, and the concern is that if we start letting one type of applicant through, then we're going to have multiple versions by who operates by what standards and what levels.

I'm a little concerned about this. The reason, as I said, it's the cut off nose, you know? The moment you give one type of applicant the ability to move forward, all of the others are going to come over and say, well, you've done it for them, you can do it for us as well.

And next thing we'll know, we'll have our next round starting at 2018 when [inaudible] will be ready.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, but my concern is that the pressure will be such that we're going to take shortcuts to get the whole job finished, and end up with another fiasco because of it, because we're not doing the job properly. I'm asking the question, I'm really not making a proposal, that does letting the dot brands in, which probably will have to arguably be the strongest argument for an early release, may be take some of the pressure off the overall groups so we can do the job properly?

Clearly it's not our turn, and it's not in the books today, but that's why I'm asking the question.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, if I may say, I'm happy that you're bringing this point forward because I think it goes deeper, it actually goes into what type of strategy do we want to adopt in responding to these types of ideas. And we need to be absolutely clear on this, because I have a feeling it's not going to be a walk in the park.

ALAN GREENBERG: No it isn't, and you know, we're a voice, the voice of reason saying, slow down, but there is some really strong other voices saying speed up, and you know, we're not going to win everyone. That's why I'm looking at other options. Yrjö.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, thank you. Thank you Alan. This is Yrjö Länsipuro speaking. As we all know, we are not alone with this concerns about the next round, or whatever you call it. The GAC is [inaudible] very much, and this is actually one of the topics for the ALAC that meeting in Hyderabad, but in our contacts with the GAC secretariat, we have already [inaudible].

And so whatever, of course [inaudible], I think it's very good that we can talk about that through the GAC and eventually explore common ground on this list. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. My position, I wrote it on the list, and you saw it everyone ready, so I will not repeat it, but I'd say, Alan, you say that we are not alone, and that's right. That's why I am not sure that if you open a small window for the brand and the like, we are not alone.

We may be on a [inaudible], and we don't know what will happen in this case. So I prefer to stick to our principles, our first position. At least we are not contradicting ourselves, and we are really, really [inaudible] think that opening any round before the evaluation is really [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone else have any other thoughts?

Yrjö, is that a new hand or an old one? Old one. All right, we'll go on to the next item then.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, someone wanted to…? Heidi, is that a new hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, that's an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Did someone want to speak?

No? All right. Then the next item, I believe is, sorry. I'm using a mouse for the wrong computer to try and scroll down and it doesn't work really well.

I'm in the process of rebuilding a computer, so I only have some function on one and some on the other.

Next item is items to the ALAC call on Tuesday the 27th. If anyone has any items now, please let us know. If not, then contribute them to Heidi and me as soon as you can.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. Just to confirm with everyone. We are going to be inviting Rinalia and I'm assuming that she's going to be discussing the results of this week's workshop in Brussels. And then I will also add a significant time to the agenda building for Hyderabad as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll remind people that tomorrow, at various times, your time, there are a couple of hours of Board workshops that will be public. If only to convince them that people do care, probably worth tuning into them if you can. If the time is not too awkward, otherwise [inaudible] to the fact is certainly something that I think would be warranted.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: And also, Alan, perhaps we can ask Olivier to share some exciting news about the results of Rinalia's efforts with the paper on Europe. And I believe, I'm assuming, it's the same one as At-Large policy document that we prepared.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not quite the same document, but go ahead Olivier. Or if Olivier can't share, maybe you'd like to share.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oliver, are you able to…?

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe he hasn't read his email yet.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Let me just pull up the email so I can quote her. She says, "Today, I gave a copy of the EURALO hot topics paper to Roberto [inaudible], European Commission Director General for Communications Network Contact and Technology. [Inaudible] was present, and he read the paper as well. Roberto indicated how much he appreciated receiving it, as he works on policies that benefit end users in Europe. Please feel free to share this information as you see fit." So well done everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND   Olivier speaking. And it does take me a little while to unmute, so that's why. But I have passed it over to EURALO. And I think that we will probably be able to follow-up as many of us have meetings with officials from the European Commission and others, and it's certainly an interesting thing that the Board would have transmitted something from EURALO all the way to the commissioner himself.

And I'm hoping that we, there could be a similar occurrence with other regions as well in the case that there will be an authority that would be of the same caliber as the commission in other parts of the world. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you have a more unified part of the world than most of us. All right. Any other business? Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Alan. Julie Hammer speaking. Not necessarily for this meeting, but I'd quite like to have a discussion with you, and Tijani, and Heidi, and whoever else you'd think is appropriate, about just a few planning issues for [BCC?] and [BMSCC?]. I've just been trying to get up to speed on that, and I've got a few questions that I want to just talk through as we play proceed.

So I'm not sure whether there might be an opportunity to hang on for five or 10 minutes after this call to do that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I certainly can, and I think Cheryl, if she has the time, she should be there too.

HOLLY RAICHE: Tijani, are you able to do that and Heidi?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I can do that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much, that will be great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I wanted to ask one thing of you, and of others, in the ALT to consider, which is the relaunch of some of those working groups that we absolutely need. And the one that I'm looking at in particular is the new gTLD working group.

I'm somehow concerned that the input that we're having into the, well the PDP and the input that we're having into the review team, are not coordinated in any way. The feedback we're getting is not using specific channels, so we have, for example, the feedback from what's going on

in the CCT goes to the internal list, and that doesn't really benefit anybody in At-Large, in our wider community whilst the working group would not only benefit our wider community in finding out that we are involved in those things, and I guess that the, this round of new gTLDs is probably the most important thing next to the ICANN accountability track.

So I really urge you to consider either asking for someone to take the lead in the new gTLD working group, or to actually appoint someone from the ALAC to run the new gTLD working group, as soon as possible, or should I say, sooner rather than later, and perhaps with the aim for this group to have the world look at what the state of affairs is today in Hyderabad. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two items out of that. I don't know why Kylie is using the internal list. It may just be that he didn't understand how they need to be used, or it maybe it is being done that way for a real reason. Heidi, could you or somebody reach out to him and find out? I don't want it to come from me. It will sound like I'm accusing him of doing something wrong.

But if you can just ask him, is there some reason that those reports need to be kept confidential to purely within the ALAC and At-Large leadership, the candidate be in a more public forum?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I can go ahead and do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And on the gTLD working group, I thought we made a decision at a previous meeting, that we were not going to try to reactive all of our working groups, but that one, it was a done deal. We need to reactive it and we need to populate it and get a chair. I don't remember whose action item it was, if it was mine, I messed up. But I don't think it was mine.

If I could ask staff to find out, go back to, it was either the last ALT meeting or the last ALAC meeting, I can't remember which. But I thought we made a definite decision that that group would be reactivated and start meetings. So if we can look into that please. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. A practical proposal. May I propose that Olivier take the lead of the new TLD working group?

ALAN GREENBERG: We will ask him.

Olivier, I won't pressure you for an answer today, but one way or another, we need to find a chair. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, Holly Raiche for the transcript. There are, as far as I can tell, a couple of working groups that are already impinging on the new gTLD

EN

stuff. I'm just wondering if we had yet another group, is this going to cause [inaudible]? We've got Kylie and Carlton looking at the, you know, that group. We've got new subsequent procedures.

I'm just concerned that the issues are going to be fragmented by having another group that's dealing with what?

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, you're confusing the groups that are doing the work and the support group within At-Large.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. All right.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're talking about is the At-Large working group to support the various efforts.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, all right. As long as it's clear, because otherwise, it's just going to have a lot of people doing things that overlap. So I think clear terms of reference and maybe revised terms of reference so people aren't duplicating stuff. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I believe we decided that this would be a support group for the CCT, the new gTLD procedures, the registrant issues, you know, a

consolidated group for that. And I believe the first step was to write a mission, if not a full charter. But we already decided that. I don't know what happened to it. It seems so long [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm glad we've re-decided it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we can try. All right, there was no… Sorry. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. Cheryl here. It took a moment for me to get off mute. I'm assuming you can hear me now.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Just on the subsequent procedures working group and the, what seems to be the concerns about, you know, the race towards decisions on next rounds. I'm not quite sure, and this is why it's important that the support group gets going, and you and I, and Holly and others that are involved in the subsequent procedures and the CCT, have the opportunity at a regular interval to interact with interested people from our community, ALAC and At-Large.

The subsequent procedures is currently running at committee as a whole, looking at some issues, but specifically the work is broken up into four particular work teams. And each of those work teams is at very early analysis stages. So I'm not sure with the fear of things happening without our input is coming from.

Yes, there is a pressure from a number of fronts for aspects of new gTLD rounds to come forward, but we're a long way from those decisions yet. I mean, we haven't even yet, as a group, as a whole, decided if there will be another round. My guess is yes, but the question of in what way, how, who, when, will it be not so much rounds but continually an opportunity?

All of that is still being decided. I am specifically engaged as one of the people heading up one of those work teams, looking at IDNs. And we are right at the analysis point. Now we are literally just reaching out for the staff analysis, and information to it on what actually happened with the specific questions and clarifying questions out of the applicant guidebook relationship to IDNs.

So, it's not like the horse is already bolted. I'm just getting sort of a mix of, oh my God, it's too late and the sky is falling, and the reality that I'm seeing, at least in the actual work happening in the subsequent procedures. So, hopefully I haven't confused anybody, but I don't think the sky is falling just yet. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, the sky isn't falling. My concern is, we've seen in a few other PDPs, and the Red Cross IOC one is certainly one that I'm thinking of,

where there was so much pressure to get an answer, even if the answer was not holy satisfactory, that the leadership of the group ends up putting time constraints on things, and comes to conclusions, even if the discussion have not really been fully satisfactory.

Now I'm not going to predicting that it's going to happen, but it has happened in other cases. And that has, you know, raised some level of concern, that we may short circuit the process and not do it properly, despite that is not our plan today.

If I can summarize the concern, that is indeed my concern. There are people who believe that, you know, the pressures have to be addressed, and one way of doing that is to put time constraints on things, which might not allow us to do the work in a proper way. That's my concern. It may not happen, but that's certainly where I'm coming from.

Okay, tasks to take home. We are looking for, if you have any thoughts on issues I might be able to bring up and the time constraints are unknown, but with Göran, please let me know. We need topics for the Board sessions, and we need what kind of things you think would be productive discussions we can have, or sessions we can have at the ALAC development session, that is both in terms of community building, group building, activities, and in terms of, if this is an opportunity for a third of the group to go off in a corner and talk about something and make a proposal, what kind of things should we be talking about?

So that can be within the policy range, within the administrative range of the ALAC, productive use of time which both gives people practice in working together and may actually come up with some good ideas. So if

you have any of those, and please, if you don't have them, you know, then Heidi and I will invite them, and you may not like the results.

Then please speak up. Any other comments? Last call for comments.

Then this meeting is adjourned. If we can have the people involved in the BCEC BMSBC current or past, then if we could stay on the line for a few minutes to address Julie's concerns.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]