
GISELLA GRUBER: Wednesday, the 27th of July at 20:00 UTC. On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Leon Sanchez, Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Yrjo Lansipuro, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Julie Hammer, and Carlton Samuels, with apologies noted from Sandra Hoferichter and Maureen Hilyard. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Yeşim Nazlar, Lars Hoffmann, Ariel Liang, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

If I could please remind everyone to please state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you very much, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I haven't seen some of you people in such a long time. Well, it's true for Carlton, actually.

All right. The first item on the agenda is policy comments, our favorite thing. Well, this is shorter than yesterday, which is something to be grateful for. I just want to do a quick review of it and see: do we know where we're going on each ones of these?

On the intellectual property rights that is way overdue, Leon and I are supposed to do something, and we will try to do that.

On the new ones, with the Fellowship Program, where are we sitting on that? I pointed out yesterday that the people who were so vocal about complaining about the program don't see to have stepped up to comment on whether this fixes their things, to say thank you, or to say, "No. It doesn't fix them."

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I'm a little bit at a loss to know where to go. Now, I can draft a statement. Anyone on this call can draft a statement on this one. But I find it somewhat disturbing that the people who are most vocal complaining are not willing to step up and do that kind of thing.

Anyone have any comments? Is it just me? In which case, I will shelve my angst and move on.

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Someone is talking, but I can't hear who it is. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I agree with you. I think if people raise an issue, then when the issue comes up as a policy list, there should be something that says, "By the way, you're the one who actually raised some comments. Have you put your hand up to do something?"

I think it's unfortunate that we raise objections amongst ourselves and nobody will actually do the hard [inaudible] of doing something about it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, it's very, very hard to hear you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I agreed with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I got that gist, but I was simply point out we couldn't nearly hear what you were saying.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's early.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. There's two days left in this comment. At some level, I don't want to leave it unanswered. On the other hand, part of my stubbornness says that no one who claims to care about these things – I certainly care – who makes the most fuss, wants to step up.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let me get rid of that echo. Thank you. Sorry about that. I didn't think there was two days left. I thought it closed on the 27th.

ALAN GREENBERG: It says the 29th on this piece of paper I have. I'm presuming that's correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] then. That was why I didn't even bother raising the point of doing something small at the ALAC meeting. I will double check on the master page.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Cheryl, it's not the start of your day, but it's not the end of your day. Do you have a few minutes to work with me later on?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next one. PTI Articles of Incorporation. I don't particularly care. Does anyone care enough? We've gotten no interest philosophically. I don't think it matters one wit. That goes for all PTI ones. I'm willing to strike them off as saying no one has any great interest, no one has expressed any interest.

Cheryl, go right ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm happy to strike them off, but not for perhaps exactly the same reasons. My reasons are not being concerned about putting a comment in unless it was a test of how a Fellow will [miss], noting the regular opportunity that we've had by the Implementation Oversight Team to have influence in development of this process.

I've served on the Implementation Oversight Team, so I'm up to my eyeballs in it, thank you very much. I could probably quote half of them by now, but I sure as hell don't need to write about them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm on it also and I haven't paid much attention for the reason I cited. Those who really care are paying attention. I don't think it makes a lot of difference in the end. It's not worth it. I didn't think it was worthy of my focus. Between the both of us, we have a variety of reasons for not wanting to focus. They're gone.

The .com Registry Agreement I think does warrant some focus, if only because the last time there was a .com Registry Agreement, we expressed some considerable angst over some of the terms in it, and I don't know to what extent anything has changed that's relevant to this point. But I think it certainly warrants a very careful review.

We have shipped it out to the various working groups. I'm not optimistic we'll get a lot back, but we might.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank very much, Alan. First on the PTI questions, the articles, and the different consultations there, I think we have to bear in mind that the CWGI and the working group has worked on this quite extensively. We've had our input in there. The articles and so on were all drafted by Sidley and reviewed. I think it would be a bit of a waste of time if we were to – I've read through the thing. I haven't seen anything that comes out that we would need to say something about this point and change it. I haven't seen anything noticeable.

What I might do is look at the other comments that have been made by other communities and see perhaps whether there's anything that we

might need to counteract in any way. But I'm certainly happy to have a look at that just after this call.

Secondly, on the .com Registry Agreement, it's a one-pager. I'm really surprised that we haven't had any feedback. It's a one-pager that basically is an aligning of terms between the – I think it's that one, isn't it? The .com Registry Agreement – root zone contract and something else. It basically then moves the contract renewal to 2022, I think, which is the date that I saw. I don't have the paper in front of me and I'm doing this from memory. It's just a one-pager that shows that.

Do we have a problem with renewing a contract in 2022, pushing it so far back? That's I think what the question that we need to ask ourselves is. It would take you five minutes to have a look at that page. It's a one-page [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I already went into it yesterday. I said my understanding was it was just aligning periods of contracts. That's exactly what I understood it to be. Although conceptually that adds several years to the current .com agreement, which delays some other changes which might come in on a renewal – and there is some negative aspects of that. There's no question about that because we're trying to align contractual terms, and this takes .com and pushes it out another few years.

So there is negative from that perception, but essentially this is critical to the IANA transition. Does my concern with extending the contract for a couple years override the ability to affect the transition that the U.S. government in its good graces granted? No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks, Alan. That's what it is. You've just answered it. It's a binary question. Do we have a problem with this? Yes. No. Of course, I feel a bit uneasy having this thing being pushed back so much. 2022 is quite a few years from now. I can't remember what the original renewal date was.

But then it also has to do with the transition, and of course it makes sense for aligning those contracts. It does. Otherwise you end up with one contract coming up for renewal against another one, and if it wasn't renewed, then there'd just be a number of problems with those unsynced things.

ALAN GREENBERG: I must admit I'm not sure why it isn't relevant to extend the .net also, but I haven't looked into it, and to be honest, it's not really high on my priority list.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's a fair point. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. As far as I'm concerned, we'll leave that one open, but if no one steps up and says there's an urgent issue, it will die. The gTLD marketplace health one I think is relevant. I think we had a number of people saying they would look at it yesterday.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. You had both Jimmy and Garth.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Okay. So that one's under control. Anything further on policy issues, or we can put that one to bed?

ARIEL LIANG: I think Jimmy and Garth weren't here to look at the ASCII-related public comments. I'm sure the health index that sent you the new gTLDs and also the Registrant [inaudible] Working Group offer people to look at. So we're still waiting for volunteers to review.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm willing to wait another week or two on that one. We have a good deadline on that one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ariel, you're right, I'm sure now, thinking through the conversation again. Does that mean you don't have or you have another volunteer for gTLD [inaudible]?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Cheryl. Yeah, we don't have a volunteer yet for the health index.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It just puts us in a rather bad state if we start complaining afterwards without actually commenting on these various documents and processes that we have put in place to try to address issues.

Let's go on to the next discussion because the next item is the report from the ALAC meeting, and the first item is the policy development discussion, particularly the whole discussion on how we get people involved – and we have to get people involved. Yet, even amongst the most committed people, when you ask for volunteers, they are few and far between. And usually they're the same suspects that have stepped up for other things. Not always, but usually.

We have this discussion on a regular basis, saying we have to do something about it. I'm looking for bright ideas. Do we just wait for the whole At-Large review and ALS criteria thing to finish and hope that, by the time we finish, we will have done enough changes that maybe people will start popping out of the woodwork? Or do we need some different tact on this?

Certainly the rate at which public comments are coming out is such that either we need to walk away from an awful lot of them, as we are right now, but it's easy right now because there are big groups of them which we have a rationale for walking away from.

I'm a bit at a loss. So, I see it won't – sorry, we have hands. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

A couple of things that would help. I know I've said it before. I'll say it again. I think we have to devote a bit more time at our actual face-to-face meetings – Hyderabad, for example – in having an ALAC discussion

about the policies so that people understand what the issues are, and we can spread some of the load. I think maybe we just need a session somewhere that says, “This is how you contribute to policy,” so there are more people who can do it.

The other thing – and it’s related, but I’ve said this people in the GNSO – is that, every time there is a new public policy thing that has the slightest impact, they should be holding a webinar so that people can actually understand what the issues are. I do think that’s a GNSO responsibility, but I think, if we can work with them and say, “How do you have webinars so that when a topic comes up for public comment, anybody can actually attend the webinar and then make an informed decision about whether to comment or not?” Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

They were doing that at one point. Has it stopped? Because there was an effort at one point to have such sessions.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I’d like to have it survive. I’d like to bring it up with the GNSO, and the GNSO liaison, to say, “Every time there’s something that looks at policies, you need to have a webinar, and it’s got to be held twice so we don’t have to get up at 2:00. Within our own meetings at Hyderabad or wherever, just point out, “These things are available,” and possibly tie it in with metrics.” If you’re a member of ALAC, we’re expected to intend the webinar, and you’re also expected to put your hand up every so often. I just think that there are three prongs to your question. Maybe there are more. That’s just my take. Thank you.

Double coffee. I think Leon's got a great idea. Double coffee and extra water.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. We have a whole bunch of hands up. I think restricting this to just ALAC is a little bit limited. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. Just some comments on some possible suggestions. First we have the DDDPP, that Document Development and Drafting Pilot Program that is just starting. They've identified actually three public comments that they want to start putting together these policy issues on. That might be a way to get people involved.

Next, I like the idea –

ALAN GREENBERG: Which public comments?

HEIDI ULLRICH: One is on IDNs. One is on – if you could help me with that. I think it's new gTLDs coming up. Let me just go back and take a look. If you could find that one, I'll go on to my other options.

ALAN GREENBERG: But, Heidi, is the intent to have these documents out when the public comment opens, or halfway through it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think just about when it opens. That's a good question. I'll make a note of that and get back to you on that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Heidi, this is [inaudible] when they open. But I'm checking.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Well, try to find out.

ALAN GREENBERG: I sure haven't heard anything about this on the PDP side.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Let me just find the e-mail, and just when I finish my other options, I'll come back on that one.

I like the idea of the three [Ps] webinars. I would actually bring them back to the At-Large webinar that we used to have quite a few of and really haven't had any in some time. That's something we could do and invite GNSO or anybody who's relevant to our particular public comments to present very briefly and then answer questions.

Thirdly, I think a real opportunity would be the two sessions that we're having in Hyderabad, these strategy sessions, to answer some of these questions on how to get more people involved early on and knowledgeable about the public comments. And then actually drafts.

That might mean something like a coaching team for [inaudible]. Then the development session at the end, where maybe ALAC can go back into little groups and then come back and suggest ideas on how to get people more involved. And then get some commitments from them as well.

Finally, we have a valuable resource that sometimes feels slightly underused, and that is Ariel, our policy analyst, in getting some information out on the impact of these public comments on end users.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Sorry. I just put the three PDPs on the chat.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Silvia. So we have the Phase 2 assessment of the [inaudible] effects associated with the New gTLD Program. That's going to open in August. Possibly Thick WHOIS. Holly, there you go. That looks like the perfect one. Transition from Thin to Thick for .com, .net, and .jobs –

ALAN GREENBERG: In the year 2020.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well. And then the IDN implementation guides, and that's going to open in September [inaudible] as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: The Thick WHOIS transition is a perfect example of people who don't want to implement things making sure that it doesn't get implemented.

Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Well, Heidi's already taken my suggestions for the DDDPP or whatever it's called – the multiple number of D's – the document production program thing. I was under the impression that the document production was actually also going to be undertaken by the RALOs on specific topics that the RALOs were interested in when it came down to policy development. So I'm a little confused about that, and maybe [inaudible] –

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what I had heard also.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, because if –

HEIDI ULLRICH: If I may, Olivier. If I may?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: In this pilot, which is going to be six months, it's going to be basically where they are going to be identifying the public comments that they believe would be of most interest to more ACs and SOs that are involved in this, and then, after that, given feedback. Then I think the next step – if it continues to be where it would be more of a specific customized approach.

ALAN GREENBERG: That hasn't been communicated very well. The last I heard was it was going to be aimed at RALOs and constituencies. But that's fine.

Olivier, if you're not finished, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Secondly, I also think that you should really make sure that your members of the ALAC are active and are actually doing things, as in leading groups. I think there are several ALAC and At-Large working groups that seem to have a Chair that has moved on. You should be looking at replacing those Chairs and basically coming individually to ALAC members and saying, "Well, look. You're not leading any group or anything like that. Just being on the ALAC is not enough. I think it's time for you to move..."

ALAN GREENBERG: You're into Item #5. Let's not dwell on that right now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ah. But that's a suggestion, though, so that your working groups – it's not up to you to have to ask and to e-mail people around and say, "Do you want to write something on this working group?" Right now, you pool the charts of people – it has reduced itself so much that it's – and with a number of requests, it's just putting so much load on a very small number of people. Try to open it up again. That's why I was going to say to get those people to chair working groups and actually do things. That's all. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A couple things, and I appreciate the fact that for once Heidi has got in before me because she picked up on a couple of points that I was going to raise, although we probably use slightly different language.

First all, where the double D, triple P – those topics that are already identified – well, I'll get tired with all of those letters. That's obviously already identified. Holly, it strikes me that certainly some of them if not all of them are the types of topics that would fit into the suggestion that you were making, which was to have a face-to-face and remote participation opportunities for discussion centered around various ICANN meetings.

And of course, where possible, we should encourage webinars to be able to be run for information about our own community, but open to other where possible and practical.

This vomiting out of sequential and overlapping – actually, it’s more of diarrheal moment, really, sometimes – of public comments that happens out of ICANN – have I made it graphic enough for you all yet? – well, you know my view. I think it’s just bloody ridiculous, where so many of them could have a degree of predictability so that we would be better able to set up and prepare for the types of outreach and engagement activities that we need to make our At-Large and community contributions to this more effective. And that’s something else we need to raise that goes back to ATRT 1 and a number of – it apparently appears to me – failed attempts to some form of coordination on and flagging of when certain topics for public comment are coming out.

That said, the concept of coaching is one of the reasons I put up my hand on this particular matter, Alan, and that is that as the unofficial mentee to half the aspiring regional leaders, existing regional leaders, and future ALAC members it would appear, I’ll be strongly encouraging I think is how I say it, some of them to pick up pens on some of these things. But we have to have the time available for that to be able to happen. You don’t have, for example, an ALAC meeting deciding that they will or won’t be making a comment on something and then in under seven to 14 days the final document supposedly has been done and dusted and probably even voted on by the ALAC. That just doesn’t work.

The new gTLD health [inaudible] one is one where mid-September – 27th of September I think it is – we may just manage an exercise like that by the skin of its teeth on that one, and that one is low hanging fruit and extraordinarily cheap and cheerful to do. It’s for heaven’s sake a beta

system on metrics and tempting as it would be for me to say Carlton should probably have a hand in that as well, I recognize that they're probably fairly busy. Some of us do have something to do with the old metrics of new gTLDs work. And we could guide a couple of pen holders or two through that very simple process on that one at least which will be a matter of, "Yeah, we think it's a damn good idea. Of course we need to have a community-based Advisory Committee," and yes, we should have after the public comment period closed the call for committee member proposals to come out. I mean, I think I've just written it. See what I mean? But we've got to be timely and able to be done in a managed way. Rant ended. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anything further? We are way over time, so it is not going to be a short meeting.

Alright, next item I think we've covered Point A of Item 4 at this point, Policy Development discussion. Next one is Rules of Procedure. We seem to have had closure yesterday on pretty much everything with the exception of the changes related to the ALT. I know I've heard Tijani's comments and Sebastien's on the proposed changes. I guess I'd like to hear from other people.

The motivation for suggesting it was to #1 to catch some words so we could describe the superset of the ALT when there was a meeting being held or something, and #2 to make it really clear that although there are liaisons there – and by the way, they're not just invited, it is in the Rules of Procedure that they are expected to participate – that when

decisions are made by the ALT they are indeed made by the five regionally appointed people, or the people appointed to represent the regions. And that was the two points are #1 to just give us some nomenclature and #2 make it really clear that the number of people present may be larger, that decisions are being made by the five people on the formal ALT.

I'm not going to die on this one, and I have no strong reason to push the word "advisor" if advisor is an offensive word but I thought it should be clear what we're doing on a regular basis because we are just documenting what has been done for a good number of years at this point and making it clear to everyone how it works. So I guess I'd like to hear from any other people, particularly those on the ALT but certainly anyone else around also.

Anyone? Anyone still here with us?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we're here.

ALAN GREENBERG: No one cares?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, if you'll give me the microphone. Clearly I care. Thank you. I mean, clearly I care. I think the ability to codify in a clear and unambiguous manner a useful practice which I think quite reasonably should remain the right and responsibility of an ALAC Chair is a fine thing. But it

appears to me that you have one if not more either utterly confused individuals or sadly misled in terms of practicality versus some utopian environment that they would like to live in, people who are concerned about it, so if you need to fall back and go ahead on the remain silent and do as you damn well please, I think that's probably a reasonable place, but I actually think you're doing a very sensible and intelligent thing and something that I would have been thinking would make us look good from a transparency point of view. But there you go.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's what I would have thought also. And I'm happy to make the words about who are the invited non-advisors and make it less specific. I just thought putting the cards on the table and saying what we're actually doing was being more open.

Yrjö?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yes, thank you. Actually I got the impression yesterday that the word "advisor" was somehow offending to some people so that I don't know, you just call liaisons "liaisons" and all the others you can invite at the discretion of the Chair.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That doesn't address the issue of what do we call the superset of people that tend to be invited to ALT meetings? Right now it's the ALT and the liaisons to ACs/Sos and the two past Chairs. That's the only way to

describe them at this point and I was trying to get at some sort of global thing just to make it easy to have piles of meetings or something else.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. Advisor doesn't help me at all, and it is not something that I don't like at all. My problem is that we are trying to open doors. Because our rules are very clear, the ALT is five people full stop. And there is also the liaison attend all the meetings of the ALT and contribute in discussion. It is clear. No confusion. More than that, all the meetings of the ALT, except in camera sessions, are open to everyone to attend and to discuss freely exactly as any member of the ALT. So what we are trying to clarify I don't understand. We are trying to put a new kind of structure to which I am objecting.

The structure is the ALT, and the ALT is composed of five people. That's all. We have other people who attend and participate in the ALT meeting. It is in the rules. And anyone that the Chair wants to invite or wants to have them participate with the approval of the ALT members, they are there.

Today it happens that they are two past Chairs. Next day perhaps it will be another kind of people that you will find necessary to invite and to make them participate in our meeting. Why do we want to formalize that in the rules? Why? What is the importance? You said it is to call it. We are calling everything by their names. The Alt is the ALT. And for the ALT there are people who attend regularly who are [inaudible]. And in the ALT anyone can attend. Anyone can participate.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, would you be any happier if we removed the section on past Chairs and say that other people may be invited by the Chair to participate in ALT meetings, without being specific as to who they are – “may,” that’s a discretionary issue.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I accept that. I accept that. We say, “With the discretion of the Chair, with approval of the ALT members,” of course. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, if we say the discretion of the Chair, no Chair is going to stare down an ALT that is vehemently against something. That’s not going to happen in our world. So I don’t think we need to put an approval step in, but I’m happy to change the Chairs to “other invited guests,” if that makes it more palatable.

The problem is I don’t like that we have practices and yet to someone reading the rules it’s not obvious. And I have been subject to a number of comments saying – let’s be blunt – Olivier is here because he’s also the GNSO liaison. I have been told by a number of people that Cheryl shouldn’t be here because she no longer holds any position. I happen to value her input. I think most of this group values her input. And I believe we should have the benefit of that experience and background. And yet I’ve been told by other people that clearly there’s favoritism going on here because she’s been invited and other people aren’t.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's an open meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is an open meeting. As I said, I have received those comments. One of the back things in my mind was to formalize the process so that I have something to point to and future Chairs have something to point to should they want to do that and not be subject to that kind of criticism which I believe is completely out of line.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If I can make a follow-up comment, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, quickly. Olivier does have his hand up, but go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You are saying exactly what I said last time. It is because she is Cheryl that we want her. You said you are appreciating her input. This is why you are inviting her. It is not because she is a past Chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, I've already taken the past Chair words off the table and said "other guests."

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, very good.

ALAN GREENBERG: You won that one. You don't have to argue it anymore. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And it's plain obvious that the mistake that those people making the criticism do not understand or don't seem to want to understand that the ALT meetings are open. And as the Chair, even if you have a closed part of the meeting – and I recall that from the times when Cheryl was running the then ExCom that there were a couple of things, a few matters where ExCom had to be in camera, but there was always the option of the Chair inviting one person or another for whatever reason it was – and more often than not it was for their expertise in the topic – to remain on the in camera part of the call.

I see what you're trying to do and you're trying to make this easy for future Chairs and I think that Tijani does have a point in that if we start formalizing this then maybe we should just say the Chair may invite people on the ALT at their leisure or whatever it is, or at their discretion, if you wish to formalize something. But to actually say that the previous ALAC chairs would be part of the ALT is [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, may I interrupt? Number one, I've already agreed to remove the Chairs. Number two, it never did say the Chairs would be part. It said, "At the current Chair's discretion past Chairs might be invited." So it

never formalized that they had to be, and besides that it's gone now. So let's not argue about why it should be gone again or I'll put it back.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: At the Chair's discretion anybody may be invited – how is that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine. Cheryl. Cheryl? I can't hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I was on mute. Very briefly, I would suggest you just remain silent because people tend to manage to misinterpret your intent. You've already taken the specifics off the table. The Chair has the unalienable right of deciding who is or is not to be heard at a meeting, and therefore you've got the ability as all future Chairs do, too. The meetings are open. So unless the ALT takes a very bold move of making all their meetings in camera and closed, there isn't an issue. But just some of us will intend to turn up more often than others.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I think we actually now have agreement on a revised version. I will circulate it in this group first and see if we indeed have agreement. If we do, then we'll go forward with it. If not, we'll pull it back.

Next item – the ICANN debriefing. I was a little bit disappointed that I explicitly said let's talk about what the ALAC can do in the ALAC

meetings, and virtually all of the comments were about the meeting format. I'm just expressing a little bit of frustration I guess. I would like to have a discussion sometime.

I and staff and Leon and [Baran] put an immense amount of effort into planning the At-Large parts of the Helsinki meeting, and I was trying to get some feedback on that. And I would still value it because it was the largest effort I can ever recall seeing put into a meeting schedule and the changes that were being made down to the very last moment were just unbelievable. And that's what I was trying to get feedback on. So I'm not quite sure, maybe I'll try it in e-mail this time. I was hoping for something better than what we got and I thank Holly. Holly did make some comments on the At-Large meetings themselves.

Lastly, on Assemblies, we glossed over it very quickly but Heidi announced that although we were funded for only two Assemblies, we would in fact do three. I don't think we got any push-back. I'm not sure it was said with enough people listening so they absorbed it.

Heidi, do you have a level of comfort that we can start going ahead with some planning on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. Susie is my trusted, ultimate budget holder and she has given thumbs up. So we can move ahead. In fact, we are significantly already advanced in the NARALO GA planning. We are just reaching out to the mediators. What the plan now is to have, for the LACRALO Assembly, we're hoping that can actually be moved a little bit later into the early part of next year rather than the autumn. So we're just waiting to see

the outcomes of the interviews, etc. and the availability and feedback from the mediators. And then the AFRALO GA next June, yes, I would hope that AFRALO would move ahead to start by doing an organizing committee and then start planning their GA.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The implication is that for the two GAs, the funding is going to be somewhat constrained. That is, lavish things may not quite be on the table or a lot of other add-ons. And I'm presuming that both groups understand that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I wouldn't talk about budget so much as let's have a – how can I put this? Let's have a General Assembly that really addresses what is needed, the need rather than the absolute wants and desires.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I just don't want any surprises going forward saying we didn't understand. I'll leave that up to you to deal with the RALOs. Tijani has a comment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you very much. I would like Heidi to explain us what kind of restriction will be done on the GA. I discussed that in Helsinki with you and you said we will have everything. We will have our Capacity Building, we will have our General Assembly, so there is no problem. So if there is another restriction, please tell us.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Tijani. As we discussed in Helsinki during the final ALT meeting, Capacity Building session in the morning, that's obviously something that is needed. So yes, that could go ahead. What I would ask is that we perhaps work with you and Aziz and perhaps prior to organizing or putting it up to our organizing committee on just some basic guidelines and parameters, and then we can go forward on that. But I'm totally supportive of AFRALO holding a General Assembly that will be of the most impact [for] the AFRALO end users.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the message is that over the last number of years some of our General Assemblies have become larger than life with extra add-on parts or extra add-on visitors and I think this at this go-round if we're going to do things like that, we're going to likely have to find private funding for some of it. It's going to be difficult to do just one more little thing. All it's going to cost is another \$10,000.

Heidi, is that a new hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, very briefly if I could. Tijani, basically if you wanted to bring a large number of people who are outside of the current At-Large Structure [representatives], that's something that would raise a concern budget-wise. So that's something that you might need to look for additional funding for. Let's talk offline or maybe with [inaudible], Aziz in the next week or so.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, that's good. Let's discuss it later. Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all. Next item – Item 5 – ALAC metrics. We have had sporadic discussions on all sorts of metrics for all sorts of people. The Metrics Group is on hold right now pending the ALS level and RALO level work that's going on. However, we do have on the books in our Rules of Procedure that we will keep track of a number of things for ALAC members and I believe for RALO Leaders. The practice of actually keeping track of it in some cases, we can go back and get it but we haven't kept spreadsheets up to date on a regular basis which includes attendance, meeting participation, other work groups and things that you're active in – essentially the things that are described within the Rules of Procedure or the position description document.

Unless someone has some strong objections, I would like to ask staff to start keeping these up to date. I have already in some cases for voting and we are doing it for meeting attendance, and start publishing these. There's going to be some flack when people see some of the results. I don't plan to label them in red and ask people to wear red armbands if they're not attending all the meetings, but it will become obvious from looking at these what kind of level of attendance we do have, level of attendance and participation. If there's any objection, I'd like to hear it now. Otherwise, it will start happening quickly. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. As per the request of Cherine in Helsinki, I have sent the paper I prepared for the ALS performance metrics. I hope it was received. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure what document we're talking about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, do you want me to answer that for you?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Tijani is referring to the AFRALO paper created for our earlier metrics work, which outlined the option, one which I think is worthwhile revisiting. I think the group discussed and agreed with that, too, perhaps under some modification. The end game is it proposes a layer of an "activity" that is linked to rights and responsibilities. If members and/or At-Large Structures don't do certain things and come up to certain metric standards, then they forgo certain rights. It's a match of rights and responsibilities and allows for a multi-level "member" approach or membership standard approach, as opposed to, "You're in or you're out."

I haven't seen that yet, Tijani. I don't know who you sent it to, but personally, it hasn't been captured. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was the document that the discussion came up when we were talking about two classes of ALS. That is the background ones and the active ones.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is correct, and it could be applicable to members as well of ALSes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I understand. The discussion today was really talking about ALAC members and regional leaders. I'm not trying to build new rules right now. I'm just taking the existing rules and saying we will start collecting and publishing this kind of information. That was the question. If anyone has any objections, speak now. I'd like to understand why. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I think I heard you mention the performance of ALAC members. I gather that this also includes the regional [elite]. It is important that you clearly set out, when it comes down to ICANN meetings, what the expected attendance of regional leaders is supposed to be because there's certainly, I think, some confusion in that. Some people don't know what meetings they need to attend. Maybe they should, so if you put it clearly out, that would be helpful. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are some people for whom no matter how clearly you mention, they will still not know they're supposed to be actually going to meetings that they've been brought to a foreign city for.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I didn't say that. I didn't say that, just for the record.

ALAN GREENBERG: I said that. I said that, however. Yes, meeting attendance at ICANN meetings is part of it. It is not the only thing. It is also attendance at ALAC meetings.

In any case, all I'm talking about is collecting and publishing the information that our rules say we should be doing and we have not for the last several years. That is what I was asking whether there was any concern about.

Holly, go right ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I do have a bit of concern about publishing broadly. Is there a way to publish just for those ALAC members? I have concerns. I don't know how the information will be used, but if it is available for the globe, it may actually be used in ways that we didn't anticipate because it seems to me what we're hoping to do is shame people in front of their peers, saying, "You're not there." That's achieved by having ALAC members have access to that information.

ALAN GREENBERG: But not the people who appointed them?

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, I'd have to think about it. I just have a little bit of a reservation. That's all. I think you make a good point. If somebody's there on behalf of a group and they're not at meetings, then that group should know. I think I'm concerned about how broadly the information's available.

I'd like to think about it. It's a concern that I haven't thought through.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly at the first level, we can push them out on the internal list. I understand there is a danger that people outside of At-Large will get it and demonstrate that people are receiving travel funds but not doing anything. There is a danger of that.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, took me a moment to unmute. Holly, the counterpoint. I appreciate your privacy position, but you [inaudible] practice with that. It goes to a matter of accountability and transparency. ICANN uses dashboard for a very good reason. If you want to look up and find out exactly to the cent how much constituency travel support every one of my rather more expensive airfares, because I happen to travel in business class under a medical dispensation, you can get onto

dashboard, and you can look it up, and you can publish it. You know what? That's a fair tradeoff for using ICANN's dime. At least in my view, it is. The same should be said at least for our leadership.

If you set up and agree to operate as an ALAC member or a RALO leader, then there's got to be some form of accountability associated with it. At the bare minimum, a sensitive but nevertheless accurate access to performance metrics, I think is absolutely reasonable. Is there a risk of it being misinterpreted and misquoted? Yes, there probably is. The solution to that is to actually have performances that don't look bad.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Hey, I've been reported as being the most expensive ICANN traveler in the world, and also claimed that I will not travel anywhere if it's not on business class, which I'd like to say is true but isn't.

Yes, those attributions come. They get distributed on Twitter, and people forget about them the next week. I don't really care.

I haven't heard any strong arguments for not starting to collect them. Holly has a little bit of concern over where they're distributed, but I don't hear that as a widespread concern. Tijani, you have your hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Just to say that I 100% agree with Cherine.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Next item: creation of a group to propose and draft rules and procedure changes for the Empowered Community. We have a deadline. If we want to have everything in place formally, we have a deadline of the end of September. There is at least one action that we have to take formally, but we could take it without having formal rules of procedure. That is to appoint our Director effective the first of October. In the absence of other processes, we could simply take a vote and that would work just fine.

However, my comfort level is such that I believe we should have some Rules of Procedure changed by then. The world won't come to an end if we don't make it, but if we can, that's fine. My inclination is to do this on a minimalist basis. That is, there are a whole bunch of powers that we have. We could itemize them one by one and have different voting thresholds and detailed processes, or we could simply say that to make decisions on behalf of the empowered community, we need a majority or a supermajority vote. We will use our normal deliberation processes for any discussions that have to happen.

I'm not saying that those three lines are going to be the changes in the rules of procedure, but my feeling is we should try to do this on a minimalist basis, at least to start with. We can always go back. I don't think this is going to be a really onerous task, but I'd like to have general agreement from this group before I propose that to the ALAC.

The second is who is part of the drafting team to put it together. I don't see the need on this one to try to do something regionally balanced. I do believe that the people involved in it should be people who have been heavily involved in the process and know what we're talking about

ahead of time. We're really looking at a small set of people who are potential candidates: that is, those who have been very active in the CCWG, in the IANA issues group, and pull a small set of volunteers out of that.

Because I think it should be a minimalist effort, I don't think this is a huge, onerous task, I think a few meetings to discuss it and then send someone off to do a first draft and then revision is all it's going to take.

I see some tick marks from Olivier and Cheryl. I guess I'd like either confirmation from other people or comments from other people as to whether that's a reasonable way forward.

We have confirmation from pretty much everyone who's on this call. I'll draft something and send it out to the ALT for confirmation and revision. We'll go ahead with that moderately quickly. As I said, the timeline is short if we do something. We don't have to, but I don't think it needs to be a huge, gargantuan effort.

Olivier, if I could call upon you, I know the GNSO has chartered a group to do its changes. Have they had any discussion on overall philosophy as to whether this is going to be to a minimalist or a huge thing?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. They haven't so far reached that level of discussion. They are aware that the GNSO has, in general, never undertaken such decisions. They really need to start from scratch. They will report regularly to the GNSO Council, of course, but they're not looking at this as being a very light endeavor. I personally think that the

ALAC has much more flexibility in the way that it does things. Probably our procedures will likely be easier than theirs, or less prone to extensive process.

That said, I would volunteer to be on the ALAC group, and I would certainly keep my ears open for the process in the GNSO Council in case that might be helpful to the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My only concern is: are we forgetting something? In our attempt to be simple, are we forgetting something important?

The GNSO issue I think is largely a philosophical one. The GNSO has process in place to make decisions, both majority and supermajority decisions. They like to think of themselves as only using that as the manager of the policy process, but on several occasions, they have used their voting structure to make other decisions and it works just fine. They just have to accept it.

It's a mindset than a process, but I have no doubt it will become a major issue for them.

Any other comments? Olivier, that's a new hand, old hand?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, Alan. It's a new hand.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's just to mention that the GNSO does have the complexity of the bicameral house. That certainly introduces complexities when it comes to voting, which in some cases, if one starts asking for supermajority, might end up with unexpected votes, as we've seen with the last elections where there wasn't a need for supermajority but for some reason the majority wasn't reached in one of the houses. It became an absolute mess with us, and things were not able to happen.

One has to remember the procedures which will need to be drafted or put together need to be speedy procedures. More often than not, when it comes down to such a vote, the GNSO council isn't that great with doing this. I think they'll spend a plentiful amount of time to try and find a speedy way to make decisions. We should also be looking at both a speedy way, but also a way that... On the ALAC, we don't have the problem of the bicameral house. We certainly have the problem of the five regions, and we have the challenge of making it not capturable, while at the same time making it something that can be called upon in a certain way by anyone. This is going to be our challenge.

ALAN GREENBERG: The bicameral house is really a red herring because the bicameral house forces some awkward voting rules, but the rules are there. The real problem in the GNSO is that most of the councilors do not have the discretion to vote what they believe. They have to go back to consult, and that consultation process is the one that can't happen quickly enough.

We don't have that problem within ALAC. Some of the regions prefer that their appointed ALAC members consult on everything. That's essentially at their level that they have to make sure that they can do it quickly enough, just as within GNSO without the stakeholder group and constituency.

In any case, I think we're okay, but yes, please keep an eye on it. I do appreciate your contributing to the effort. I'm hoping it will not be a gargantuan effort, though.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, I'm putting my hand up again, just to [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I can't tell when it goes down and up. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. I did put it down for a few seconds. Then I put it back up again. I'm kind of dancing Macarena at the moment, it seems. Just one last thing. The community powers are extremely important. If you're looking at, just to give you an idea of the magnitude, the removal of the ALAC selected Board Director. We've made so many provisions and we've been so careful in the process that we've used to select an ALAC selected Board Director. I really believe we should be equally as careful in designing a procedure to decide to propose the removal of such a Board Director.

I do think it's not going to be such a fast thing because it might be that we would need different tracks or different processes for different powers, depending on what the power is. Anyway, the working group will probably go into it. We really need to start ASAP on it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm not convinced all of that needs to be in our Rules of Procedure. We may well have process documents, and we have other ancillary processes that we follow, but they don't necessarily have to be in the rule of procedure.

Anyway, that's my position. We'll see how it turns out. We have 15 minutes allocated for ICANN 57 planning. I don't know quite what it is we would like to do here. I'll turn it over. My name, Leon, and Gisella is on it. I'm not quite sure who's going to take the lead here or what it is we're doing. It's not me, so I'm presuming it's Gisella or Heidi. I'm happy to drop the item if we want to move ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I think we'd just like to go over a few updates that we've had in the last few days. Then I would like to just mention something again that At-Large staff intends to move forward with. I'm going to bring it first over to Gisella for some updates and questions that she may have, and then I'll come in at the end. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Heidi, thank you. I just announced yesterday on the ALAC call that we were going to have a call with the meeting team today, so I'd have loads

of information for you today. Unfortunately, it was canceled due to unforeseen circumstances of one of the meetings team members, so we're planning on having that call next week. That call is going to help me with the scheduling on the block schedule that we'll be putting forward and then to fine tune on the various groups we want to be meeting with, etc.

Also, on general logistics as we've said at numerous times, the ICANN 57 is going to be challenging with regarding to logistics, hotels, where they're situated, shuttles being required to get to the convention center. We're possibly even looking into having midday shuttles to get people back to their hotels if need be to freshen up and then come back. All that information, we don't have yet, and we're just getting it in drips and drabs. We really would like to be able to give you some more detailed information.

This is prior to the webinar that is scheduled on the 7th on September. That is the block that Nick Tomasso sent out. I think that we have quite a bit of work to do between now and the 7th of September, so the sooner we get the information and pass it onto you, the better. We are aware of the fact that people will be taking a little bit of break in August, but we'll hopefully keep the ball rolling. I haven't started the countdown to Hyderabad yet, but I know it's just around the corner.

A little update that we've had since yesterday is that we already have a date and a time penciled in for a meeting with the ALAC and the Board on Sunday, the 6th of November between 11:00 and 12:00. What would help me is just to confirm the other groups that you'd like to meet with so that we can send them invitations. We already get this on their

schedule. So the GAC, the ccNSO, SSAC, IPC. As I mentioned yesterday, we have had a meeting with NCSG in the past. Do we want to have one with [NPOC]? How do we wish to take this forward? Decision making on who to meet with.

That is the update that I've got since yesterday. Also, the issue of vaccines was raised in yesterday's call. Just to say that that is to be covered by the per diem. I will put in the chat the link where it actually stipulates that the only additional cost that ICANN will cover is for the visas.

Does anyone have any questions at this stage?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just the question, someone raised the issue of concern over visas and that September may be a bit late. Someone else implies that visas could be obtained electronically and therefore were not an issue. I haven't looked into it myself.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead, Gisella. You know the answer.

GISELLA GRUBER: [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. What we need to have confirmed is that we might be able to get the visas at the airport, but they just need to make sure that this meeting is considered – it's the terminology for the meeting, whether this is like a specific business trip, in which case we will be able to possibly get visas at the airport. Then again, Joseph is working on that, and that will be addressed on our call next week. I'll get back to you as soon as I have the information.

I agree. The 7th of September is too late for that because people will need to get the visas. If they do need to get a visa, we always have visa issues. Hopefully we will have, as far as the ALAC is concerned, as many responses as possible next week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, visas at airports can be really problematic. Airlines are not necessarily well-informed and will not necessarily let you on planes if you don't have a visa. I personally am reluctant to fly halfway around the world and hope I get the visa at the airport, but that maybe is just me.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead. Gisella, are you finished?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Heidi. It was the e-mail from Joseph, which says that there is a provision to do an e-visa upon arrival. It's if we are valid for a casual

business visit. That is what I was looking for. They're busy confirming that with the hosts or not.

I agree, Alan, traveling halfway the world and getting there and not being sure to have a visa. It would be great to have them ahead of time.

As for the vaccines, I'm just trying to find the best website. I've found a few, and there are quite a few shots that one does. I'm hoping that we'll be able to get a little e-mail out to everyone to make sure that they don't wait to the last minute to do this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm not worried about telling them which vaccines. Let their doctor or healthcare provider do that. The question was does ICANN pay for vaccines? Does ICANN pay for malaria medication? Hyderabad is right in the middle of a serious malaria zone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

As I understand it, the answer is no. That comes out of your per diem.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I understand. In the past, that has not always been the case, but my understanding is that is what they're saying today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Now, should the per diems be appropriately reviewed, considering malarial requirements? Yes, but that is a different question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know in Canada, where medication is cheap, it's about \$10 a day. I don't know what it is in the U.S.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And if you're allergic to anti-malarials like I am, and you have to stick with your antibiotics, it's not as expensive as people who will be taking the antimalarials, so it's a whole variation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyway, as far as I'm concerned, I don't give a damn. I'm going to take care of myself regardless of whether someone's paying for me or not.

All right, anything else on ICANN 57? Yes, Heidi, you said you wanted to
–

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, just really quickly, and then I see a couple of hands raised. I just wanted to let everyone know that as of now, during Helsinki, staff are going to develop a new, more efficient agenda, and we're going to just go ahead and start using it as we start preparing, and then we'll probably come back to you to fill in some of the details as well, but we truly believe that that's going to be more useful, so hope that you indulge us.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, Heidi, say that again.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so I'll make it just a reminder that we suggested in Helsinki that a new type of agenda be used, and that would include more of a table format, where for each meeting there would be documents needed, there would be basically who's in charge, who's leading that, there would be ends and outcomes desired for that session, so people are more aware of what the discussion is about, what they need to know and what the aims of that particular session are.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you're abandoning the one with touchy feely faces and everyone smiling but that gives no information whatsoever?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, that's for At-Large. I'm talking strictly from the At-Large agenda [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, fine. At-Large, okay. I hope you're saying ICANN is abandoning the other one also.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I have no say in that, but anyway, just to let you know that we will show you shortly an example of that. We do believe that you will find it more useful and efficient.

ALAN GREENBERG: And how will you handle multiple languages in this one?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We are going to then add links to this one, so we'll have separate wiki pages for each of the language versions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sounds good to me.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you have anything else, or should I go to the hands?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go to the hands.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: To repeat what I said at the ALAC call, in developing a schedule for ALAC, could we actually leave time for some of the things we've said on this call, such as the possibility of discussing issues amongst ALAC, having some kind of seminars on policy and stuff? My experience has

been – I've suggested this before a couple of times, two or three times, and by the time we get to the schedules on what we're doing, there are no time slots. So could we just stand back and say what we've talked about today requires time, and fit it in as part of the process, instead of afterwards saying "Oh, so sorry, we'll do that next week or next session?"

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, you've made the statement several times. I said we would do our best. When the messages go out saying "What do you want to say?" Make sure you speak up, and when we start reviewing agendas, if we haven't met your target, speak up. We may not meet everyone's targets.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: But you have to take some level of ownership in it also, not just assume we're going to do good things.

HOLLY RAICHE: I have.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're trying to balance a lot of different things.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know that, I'm just saying my experience has been I do raise an issue a lot, and I'm just doing it again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Leon mentioned in the chat that regarding visa requests within 30 days of arrival. It is indeed my understanding that the visa, if one goes for an e-visa, that would probably be within 30 days of arrival. Others would be either six months or 12 months, depending on how much you want to pay for it. So one could, in theory, already apply for a visa now via the normal means, and the simple reason why I made the request yesterday if we could advance that travel advisory or whatever it is that the [inaudible] travel is going to provide us with, so as to be able to use that month where many people don't actually travel because it's holiday time or travel to exotic places, so don't need their passports over to August.

I'm really concerned that come September, I know I'm traveling non-stop all over the place, and as you very rightly said, the visa on arrival is rather worrying in some cases. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, is that a new hand?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, sorry, that's an old one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything further on ICANN 57?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Um.

ALAN GREENBERG: There was someone who said um. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks, Alan. You haven't addressed that – I've mentioned in the chat, would it be of interest to have a meeting with the Registry Stakeholder Group? I have had some discussions within the GNSO with the different constituencies, and it's clear that the two constituencies that the ALAC has not met with in a while are the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the Registry Stakeholder Group.

The registrars we have very strong and frequent links through their previous Chair, Michele Neylon, and now they're having a new chair in place. Maybe they might wish to have one meeting to get settled, but certainly, the registries' constituency has been – well, I've been approached by them, they've been very eager to have a meeting with the ALAC, and see what we could discuss. And certainly, there are some points – as you know, the registries' constituency has changed so much

because of all of the new arrivals, it might be interesting to have a chat with them.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm certainly willing if they are. If they have approached us, then we should try to put something together.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Not in an official way, we haven't been approached in an official way, but it's just been circulated and it would be an interesting idea to perhaps have a chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't saying it was official.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And I would certainly say that perhaps a meeting of the leadership teams would be a good thing, rather than a full-out meeting of the full ALAC with the full registries.

ALAN GREENBERG: Make a proposal, and we'll do something. Certainly with the leadership team, it's a lot easier. The other group we haven't met with in a long time – although they have tried valiantly – is the business constituency, or the Commercial Stakeholders Group. They invited us to breakfast numerous times, but we could never make it because of other conflicts, and they've just stopped asking at this point, but it may be worthwhile

approaching whoever is leading that stakeholder group now – I don't know who it is – to see if there is some interest in trying to do something in Hyderabad.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think that is Elizabeth Thomas-Raynaud who is in charge with the business constituency.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, not business, the Commercial Stakeholder Group.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, sorry. I can't remember that offhand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If you could do some informal discussions, perhaps.

All right, anything else on ICANN 57? Last call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, sorry, I misunderstood you here, or maybe I did understand you. Do you wish me to try and make contact, or are you saying to follow up on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: See if there's any interest. We were invited a number of times, Tony Holmes was chairing it for a while – at least I believe he was chairing,

and they would have breakfast meetings on constituency day and we always had the ICANN Board meeting, so we ended up with conflicts and we couldn't do that. So see if there's still some interest. Certainly, with the business constituency, we have had a lot in common and had generally good relations. We're now talking to the IPC. Maybe we're doing it individual and there's no need to do it at the stakeholder group. I'll leave it to you to feel people out and see if there's some need or not.

Gisella, yes, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, just to say Chair of the BC is now Christopher Wilson, I met him in Helsinki.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of the because, you're saying?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next item: At-Large Review. Would Holly or anybody care to spend a few minutes? There was a meeting earlier today of the review team.

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible]. I'm absolutely happy to say that everybody got an e-mail from Tom, it updated everybody. I don't think there's anything to add at this stage. Check the timelines.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, done. Any Other Business?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just wanted to point out that we needed some information about questions to be asked shortly by staff to start calling the At-Large structure representatives. I know that you said that you're going to start moving ahead again with the ALS Criteria and Expectations Taskforce, but one of the questions that might be useful is getting the questions that the staff person can start asking ALSes.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you're soliciting questions from this group, or you're going to ask on a wider level?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Both.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And I do see that Lars wanted to speak as well, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't see that, but Cheryl and Tijani, which item is this on?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: IRB, so go back to Lars.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, let's go back to Lars.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thank you, Alan, thank you everyone. Yes, I did want to add just a couple of things. I think Holly covered it very well, there was a good e-mail sent over by Tom. If you haven't seen it, you can go to the ALAC Review Working Party e-mail list and you should find it there, [inaudible] the findings of [inaudible] team, or the work that [inaudible] team has done today. I believe about 80 interviews, and they're now in the process of putting together the online survey, which hopefully will go out to a much – or will have a much larger response rate [inaudible] scale there, and to assure that the widest section of the At-Large and the wider ICANN community has heard of this interview process.

And then we can expect some preliminary findings to give you just a look ahead in Late October from [inaudible] that should kind of summarize their thinking and potentially have some preliminary recommendations, to kind of see where the work is going, and this will also be presented in Hyderabad and more community feedback is sought at that point, and then the preliminary report should be out by the end of November, early December, which also will be out for everyone in ALAC to comment, but it will be published for a general ICANN public comment period.

At the moment, if you have any questions, put them in the chat or reach out to me or ask them on this call. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My recollection was that they were supposed to present a draft report to the working party prior to something being made public.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Yes, absolutely, Alan. Absolutely correct. I can go into more detail. The report will not just be put out for public comment without anybody seeing it before. It will be discussed with the working party, who is also then free to reach out to other parts of the At-Large community, and then eventually, it will be put out for public comment at the end of November. The report will be seen and known by community members before that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anything else on the At-Large review before we go on to AOB?

I'm sorry, I missed that. Heidi, there's an "At-Large structure application issues" that you've put on the agenda. I don't know what that is.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That was the issue we brought up for AFRALO, the dual membership.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, we're discussing that with AFRALO first though.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, alright. Onto any other business. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Take Tijani first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan and Cheryl. In my point of view, we are losing a lot of time during this kind of meeting. Why? Because we are

doing this meeting one day after the ALAC, and all members of the ALT are members of the ALAC, so we are discussing and repeating what we said yesterday.

My point of view is that this meeting should be before the ALAC meeting, to prepare for the ALAC meeting, and that we normally hold two meetings of ALT, the second will be after the ALAC meeting to implement or to do what is necessary to do according to the decisions taken inside the ALAC meeting. Today we repeated several sections, and we said exactly what we said yesterday. I think we shouldn't do that in the future.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. I guess I have to disagree. We certainly talked about some of the same things, but it was as a follow-on based on what happened on the ALAC. So this call normally is not the day after. Normally we allow a few days, but the timing this week did not allow that. But in general, I don't think we did the same things over again. There were a few that we probably shouldn't have, but most of them were based on the decisions or based on the discussions of what happened at the ALAC meeting.

There is normally another meeting, there's the second monthly meeting, which is typically held a week or two weeks before the ALAC meeting, and that one we seem to have gotten a little bit out of sync at this point, so I agree with you on that one.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. This is probably a raising of awareness issue rather than something for a full frank and fearless discussion now, but I gather that it would suit the Leadership Team to look at this first, rather than take it to the full ALAC, and indeed the regional leadership, if that is going to become necessary.

I am increasingly concerned, if not downright distressed with the enthusiasm of one or more regions – but really, it's mainly one – in its "rationalization" of At-Large structures, and the difference between facilitating and engaging as opposed to some sort of purge to suit who knows what agenda.

I am aware of a likely proposal for the decommissioning of several At-Large structures within one region, where the At-Large structures have indicated to the regional leads that their issue is practical difficulties in engagement, not a lack of willingness or the fact that they've fallen off the face of the earth. This [mix] of the ability to capture within our regions and At-Large structures, it is something that I think I will be raising as part of my interest with the At-Large review for the regional and ALSes.

I want to remind the Leadership Team that it is ALAC appointments for At-Large Structures to become accredited, they merely take the advice – and do what they will with it – from the regional At-Large organizations, and it will come – if the decommissionings comes before the ALAC, I will be advocating very strongly that there is serious concern.

Moreover, because of the nature of these particular At-Large Structures, it is a matter of accessibility and our intent to be fully inclusive would come under great questioning if these types or classes or particular At-Large Structures were decertified by the ALAC, and should that come to pass or if I fear it will come to pass, I am going to look at whether or not I can take it on as a form of class action on behalf of similar At-Large Structures with the ombudsman. And hang onto your seats, ladies and gentlemen, because the last time an Ombudsman went through ALAC, it was when I took over, and may God go with you when they do it again.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I was there. I don't want to do that again. I do have a couple of comments, and rather pointed ones also. I'm not going to go in camera though.

The last set of decertifications that the ALAC did was done with a number of interesting messages sent out, expressing some level of concern that due process had not been followed in doing that. The ALAC's reaction in general was just like the general ALAC reaction on certifications is, or accreditations. That is, the regional advice is given to us, we will simply follow it. That belies the fact that it is – as Cheryl pointed out – an ALAC decision, and there is a due diligence – and I'm not using the reference to the form as staff fills out, but a responsibility of ALAC members to look at the process and the documents, and all the more so for decertifications.

I will be honest, I voted against several of those decertifications, and because I didn't believe that reasonable process had been followed, but nobody else seems to even look at the documents. I don't know how we can get a better level of ownership, but it is an issue that I certainly have some concern on in the general case. And I'm not speaking to the specifics of this one where I can also go on at some point, but I think we have a general issue that RALOs are largely autonomous. There is nobody other than the Ombudsman or the Board – should it choose to step in to override what a RALO does in general. We're seeing more situations where that is problematic, and I have no clue how to address it.

Anyone else dare to speak, or do we adjourn the meeting? Silence, maybe everyone has left already.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, thank you for that, and just to be clear, should I bring it as an action to the Ombudsman, it would be the ALAC procedures that would be being reviewed, and therefore, it might be a very harsh lesson on reminding them what their responsibilities and rights are.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think our procedures are fine, how they're carried out is a different issue altogether. But yes, I understand. Let's continue this discussion in various forms.

Any further comments before I adjourn? Thank you for bearing with us for this slightly longer than normal meeting, and enjoy the rest of your week. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye all. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you all, the meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call, and wishing you a good morning, good afternoon or good evening, wherever you may be. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]