

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team monthly call on Thursday, the 6<sup>th</sup> of October at 21:30 UTC.

On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Apologies noted from Holly Raiche and possible Sandra Hoferichter, as well as Yrjö Länsipuro.

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

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Anyone have any comments on the agenda, or do we adopt it as shown?

No comments, no hands, then we will go ahead with it. Item number three is policy development. Ariel, do we have anything new that we need to decide?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel for the record. We don't. We're just waiting for Alan's action on the request from the PTA working group...

---

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

---

ALAN GREENBERG: And Alan's waiting for Cheryl. Alan is about to submit it without Cheryl's comments, but we'll give her a little bit more time, because we know that she's sort of busy.

Any other comments anyone wants to raise? I know the Latin American Caribbean DNS marketplace study is the, LACRALO is looking at it has, is waiting for more input. And I see a hand from Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I have an inquiry regarding creating a consumer agenda at ICANN, and what is the plan for this?

ALAN GREENBERG: What is the...?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The plan, the plan for this, because it has been stated in progress, in process [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: We have had a number of meetings on it. It needs to be updated, it hasn't been updated. There will be discussions on it in Hyderabad. And hopefully, by the end of that, we will have something we can pass on to the Board.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think it's any more current than that. Garth has not been present at any of the discussions that we've had about it, whether he has listened to the calls afterwards, I don't know. I'm willing to revise it, but I didn't really want to take unilateral action to do that. I think that's where it stands.

Item number four, ICANN 57. I'll turn it over to Gisella, who has some interesting information for us.

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here. I'm just checking that you can all hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can. I can.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much, Alan. I'm just going to start by sharing the current ICANN block schedule, which is up on the website with you. You'll see here that in black, we have the high interest topics that have been added. This will now only change on the block schedule, and again, this is not set in stone.

---

This is still work in progress. We had a call today, there may be a few changes, and I don't know when that is going to happen, but hopefully by next week, the schedule will be set in stone, as we need to have this finalized. There may still be a call with the SO AC SG chairs next week, to finalize the high interest topics, but I just thought I would show you this.

And then I'm going to show our At-Large schedule, to show the conflicting sessions, which at the stage, we've minimized [inaudible] at this stage. The interesting part of the Hyderabad meeting is the sponsored lunch. The sponsored lunch is going to be held every day of the week.

We will be getting tickets for the week, which will allow us to go and get lunch. The only issue with this is that it is at the high tech part of the conference center, and that is a five to seven-minute walk from the main conference center. This is going to be challenging with the current lunchtime meetings that we have scheduled.

So again, work in progress. I'm not going to spend much more time on that because we are looking into option B, plan B for all of the lunch sessions. And as soon as we have an update on that, I will let you know. The gala night is on Saturday the 5<sup>th</sup> of November. It will be held at the high tech as well. Again, a five to seven-minute walk from the venue.

The start time will be 7:00, which will allow us to go directly from the meeting to get to the gala without having to worry about shuttles and any security issues. The gala will be entertainment and then a dinner, and then the shuttles will start back to the hotels...

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I presume despite the no walking in Hyderabad rule, walking between the convention center and the high tech center is presumably safe and whatever.

GISELLA GRUBER: Confirming that yes, it is safe, and there will be... The ICANN will have in place security. It won't be like Durban, because I believe it's very safe. The whole center there will be with very many ICANN people, so we don't have to worry about that.

I'm going to now...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, this is Heidi. Just to [inaudible], mention that there will be shuttles going, leaving directly from the gala to the various hotels. [Inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, you're a bit hard to hear.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: I could make it out, I presume others do, but you were sort of talking across the room.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, sorry, my headset is half-broken. So yeah, the shuttles will go, leave directly from the gala to the various hotels.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

GISELLA GRUBER: Just bear with me for a second while I get a rough schedule up on the Adobe Connect. I did send it around to everyone in email format, just to make it easier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Before you go there, you have an agenda item saying constituency day. I note the singular. On the last AC SO call with the meeting planning people, there was a vociferous demand, in some circles, to go back from the two mornings to a full day. They took that away with the comment saying that they may well do something about it. Is that not happened? Is a decision been made not to merge it back into a day? Or is it still being discussed?

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, this is Heidi. So no, there has been no decision made and they're still waiting to hear from all of the ACs and SOs, and the ALAC is one of them. So, there were three options. And Alan, [inaudible], I can get

---

them to you shortly. But I think the deadline for that is [inaudible], next few days for that.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, bear with me. I was just looking for that email. It is in the next couple of days, sorry, I don't have it at hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: So there will be an email going to chairs or something like that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It has already gone to the chairs. Let me, in just a few minutes I'll be [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right, back to you Gisella. Or Olivier has his hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes thanks Alan, it's Olivier speaking. And as you know, I'm on that list and I was wondering why you hadn't answered yet, because I think the deadline is before the end of the week, if not by tomorrow... [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: ...I hadn't noticed it. What would you like me to answer?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, that's the question I was going to ask, if we could discuss this. Should we split constituency day into two? Or should we have it in one day. Because, as you said, there are some vociferous voices to go one way, but there are also others who are very strongly, because they've already done their preparation, very strong on actually keeping it in one day.

So it might well be that we somehow hold the balance between one or the other.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suspect, and I haven't added up the hours that the sessions that are currently scheduled, there are more hours than would be in a single day if it was a single day. Just looking at the blocks, I'm guessing that. Because we have six blocks of presumably an hour and a half each, or something, which is longer, well, is roughly equal to a given day.

I don't much care, personally. I think we will use the time effectively, regardless of which days it's organized on. So, I really don't care a lot. I care more that they've taken so many of the possible sessions away from us, with the high interest topics, in that if, indeed, we think that we have a part of our community that would be interested in all of those, they've wiped out an awful lot of sessions, or session blocks that were previously available to general sessions or other things that we might be interested in, or sessions that we can use ourselves.

So, but that's not one of the things that's being discussed right now. So, I really don't care. If anyone else has strong opinions on whether we keep the current two mornings or go back to the two mornings and



---

early afternoon, or go back to a single constituency day, then please speak up.

Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan, thank you. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Thanks. I think that looking at it, if we were to ask for it to go back to one full day, I think you're absolutely correct in that it does appear that we would have less time for ourselves. And I'm always a little concerned during constituency day, we do have a very high, hard core, we push a lot, we've got very fully days.

And having two mornings is probably better for keeping people's interests up, then having the full day, especially when we know, you know, the dreaded 14:00, the 2 PM session where everyone has got food in their stomach and are half-sleeping.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is that in this version, we have two after-lunch sessions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But they're not sessions that you'll be running. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: ...I believe the constituency mornings run into the first session of the afternoon.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: As well?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know, that schedule disappeared already. Gisella, how do the hours compare if we have what it currently the split constituency day versus if it was a single day?

GISELLA GRUBER: Just bear with me for a second.

ALAN GREENBERG: It looks like there are three sessions, six sessions of an hour and a quarter each. So that makes six, seven and a half hours, which is probably about what we would get in our day if we push people hard enough.

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may, from [inaudible], the three options were, two-day format, which are the morning sessions, and that is six total time slots. Option two is one full day format, and that is five total time slots. Or option three is no preference. Sorry, I've found the email, the feedback was to end today, at 07:00 UTC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh dear.

---

GISELLA GRUBER: If ALAC does want to submit something, we need to get it in straight off.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's finish this discussion, and then if you'll submit for us. So Olivier, you'll notice the quote, morning, split mornings, includes the 13:45 to 15:00 session, so it does include two of those, you want, post-lunches. It does give us slightly more time, and also gives us more time to prep and work between it.

I have a slight preference for the split day, but it's not a strong one. Anyone else want to provide a preference? Olivier agrees.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree as well...

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know who is speaking.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. [Inaudible] computer is, I'm working [inaudible], so I just wanted to voice my support for the split session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone want to oppose it? No one is pushing for the single day. Gisella, or Heidi, or someone, can you submit the ALAC preference?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I can go ahead and do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: And you can say it's a slight preference. It's not a strong one, as some of the GNSO groups. Next item, Olivier go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Just quickly, one of the other reasons, I guess, is that currently the schedule is as is, with this split. If we start now moving things around at this very late moment in the game, I'm very concerned that it's going to be really hard for us to setup our own sessions.

So let's go the path of least work. Least work for you, least work for us.

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't have full control over what the decision will be, but it is what it is, and we will react. I would like to sometime before we finish, do a brief run through of what the high interest topics are, and just try to get a feeling for whether we dare hold anything against any of them.

But Gisella, go ahead with what you were planning.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan. Gisella here. That is next on my, on the agenda, is just to show, that again, nothing much has changed in our schedule, but I

---

did send around the Excel format, which will be slightly bigger and easier on the eye. We're doing our best here to show it. So what I've added here are in the white and blue writing, are the high interest topics as they stand now.

And the gray boxes next to them, Wednesday and Saturday, the gray box next to, how to do outreach within each SO and AC, it hasn't yet been discussed on this call today, whether or not we are to hold any other sessions against these. Again, if we can decide which sessions we're not going to hold any meetings against, and keep these non-conflicting, if and when things do change around, at least that will already help me in the initial scheduling phases.

I'm hoping that things aren't really going to change around. But again, it's to help you see... Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, what's the difference between a gray box beside a white and blue, and a TBC beside a white and blue?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. The gray box happened to be there, because prior to that it was the GDD non-conflicting session, but the TBC behind them, next to them, is just whether or not we hold a meeting running...

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no difference.

---

GISELLA GRUBER: I put it... No, and I put a gray box next to the public interest group. Maybe we do wish to hold another meeting at the same time. So it would be quite useful, already now, if we ran through the eight high interest topics, just to see which can or can't be conflicting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let us do that.

GISELLA GRUBER: Let's start with, on as you see, the Saturday, how to do outreach within each SO and AC, which runs in the 11 to 12:15 morning slot.

ALAN GREENBERG: My cynical answer on that is that the groups are different enough that I don't think that there is a lot in it for us to attend that one. Others? Cheryl agrees. Nobody else cares. Then that's one we can hold something against. Next item. [CROSSTALK] Olivier is a rabbit running away from the subject. I don't understand that.

Now, he's a car driving from it. You're very innovative, would you care to tell us what you're saying?

GISELLA GRUBER: You must have found the new symbols under the new Adobe Connect rooms, which I have...

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Apparently. One means speed up the other means slow down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       It's Olivier speaking. I don't wish to take any further time on this, but yeah, I mean, I have no preference...

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Okay, fine. We've made a decision. That's an open slot we can use. Mitigation of abuse in gTLDs, that one, I think, we're going to have to keep. If no one puts up their hand or disagrees, I'm assuming everyone agrees with me. I always like everyone agreeing with me, in any case.

That's a joke, sort of. Update on WHOIS related initiatives. Again, I don't think we can afford to pretend we don't care about that. Everyone agrees. Next...

GISELLA GRUBER:                   Public interest group At-Large advisory committee.

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Where do you see that?

GISELLA GRUBER:                   At Sunday, did I miss one? Sunday from 15:15 to 16:45. It's in green, sorry, it should have been in white. My apology.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we can skip our own meeting, can we?

GISELLA GRUBER: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you suggesting we should schedule a meeting against our own working group meeting?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, no way. I've already put it in green, so that means that that is really not even a question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right. Okay, I don't know why we're discussing it.

GISELLA GRUBER: Exactly. Underserved regions in ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I think that's about places where there aren't registries and things like, and registrars, and I think we have enough people coming from these regions, that I think it's something that we have to pay attention to. There is very strong opinions on what we should be doing,



---

and how we should be addressing it, if anything at all. So I think it might be, in fact, be an interesting meeting.

Next one.

GISELLA GRUBER: Non-conflicting, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is non-conflicting, correct.

GISELLA GRUBER: Next one, transparency and legal advice given to ICANN to preserve its principles and openness.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now, I don't quite know what that... I do know what that is, but I'm not quite sure why it's there. That essentially says we should have access to legal counsel advice, unless of course, there is some reason that we shouldn't have access to legal counsel advice. I thought that is sort of implicit in the new openness of the Board.

And going along with access to information and access to documents. So I'm not quite sure I know exactly what that topic will really be, other than people repeating over again that we want to see things. Does anyone else have any insight?

Tijani, go right ahead.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. This is the business constituency, and the NCSG were very, how to say? They're insistent on the transparency issue. And especially to [inaudible] about the legal aspects, etc.

So I think it comes from there, and for us, and my point of view, if we don't have time... If we have time, I think it's a good thing, but if we don't have time, I am saying [inaudible] if you have other interesting things. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I could put a description on this, but it's probably not a good description in public forum. It's going to be people talking at each other, agreeing with each other, and other people who don't agree being silent. And ultimately, the lawyers and the Board decide what is public, what is capable of being public or not, so I'm not sure it has large value.

So I tend to agree with Tijani that, you know, if we really run out of stuff to do, we can keep it open, but otherwise I'm not going to feel bad about running something against it. It's a good one to listen to the transcript afterwards, or read the transcript, listen to the recording, I think, if you are really interested.

Internet governance. We know nothing about internet governance, we don't care anything about it. There is no one in our group who has any

---

interest in it, or is involved in it, so I think we should run something against that one. Right Olivier?

[LAUGHTER]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't know. Internet governance, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Obviously, that is non-conflicting. Next.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, if I may. Sorry, [inaudible], is that an open slot, I was just...

ALAN GREENBERG: We will hold it in abeyance, but it is capable of being open, yes.

GISELLA GRUBER: So not concerned.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: If we don't need it... At this point, barring other ones we haven't seen yet, because they've scrolled off the screen, it will be the last one to be used. Let's finish, and then we'll review.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Have given you scrolling rights.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And I don't see any more open, oops, hold on. My scrolling didn't work.

GISELLA GRUBER: ...is the DNS and content regulation, in any case, we've got the ALAC development session. As it stands now, we've got possibly against the transparency on legal advice, and definitely on how to do outreach within SO AC. Other than non-conflicting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess that is correct. So I will say that at this point, we will schedule something against the transparency. If we really run out of topics, we may give it back, but let's presume we'll use it. Settled?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. Heidi, if I can just hand it over to you, possibly, just to go on to the development of the agendas, and survey on topics. If you would like to show the results of the surveys, I need to do a screen share, but I've got

---

a little logistical issue on the side, so if you could just bear with me for a few minutes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Gisella, perhaps Ariel can do that? She is the super expert at screen sharing, and she has the results on that. So this will give us some indication of what some of the preferences are among at least 11 people.

ALAN GREENBERG: I explicitly did not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So you can see that there are... We're looking to just [inaudible]... Ariel, do you want to take over on this?

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry, it took me a moment to unmute. [CROSSTALK] ...in the chat... I'm going to put the ranking in the chat so you can see it on your screen as well. So basically the first question is about the groups [inaudible] on popular topics. And then you can see, they're arranged on rows based on people's preferences. And then we have 11 people, in total, voted.

And then the ones above this line, that's under row 12, these are the ones that have more than five people said nothing [inaudible], and then the ones below the five or less, we must invite. A lot of people said we have no preference.

---

So I guess, I will just give you a quick read out on the ones that must be invited, and these are the At-Large review related staff members in ICANN, and then the CEO and the Board Chairman, and also Rinalia, and also policy development support, David Olive, GSE, and then the CCWG accountability co-chairs, and finally, the finance department people, and then the [inaudible].

So these are the top choices. And that doesn't mean the others, people don't want to invite them, it's just I think, the majority of the respondents either have no preference, or they think they don't need to be invited.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I don't understand line number 10. Does anybody have any idea why people want the co-chairs to come and talk to us?

Nobody has any idea. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. I don't have any idea, but I have a point of view, an opinion. I don't think it's useful to invite the chairs of the CCWG. There will not be any other added value, in my point of view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I strongly support that point of view. Anyone disregard...? Anyone else willing to disregard the advice? It was only a seven out of 11, it wasn't a

---

huge majority. Interestingly enough, no one said do not invite. I would have, if I had filled it out.

Are there any other ones that people feel we should not do, that is above the line? Above line 12? Above row 12? We're looking at a significant chunk of our time being used in these invited guests. Is there anyone, anything there that we feel we should not do?

Go ahead, Julie.

Can't hear you.

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry Alan, my internet has been intermittent. Apologies. Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can, very well.

JULIE HAMMER: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

JULIE HAMMER: Can you hear me now?

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Apparently you can't hear us.

JULIE HAMMER:                    Sorry, I have intermittent internet, so apologies, if you've covered this. I can, can you hear me? [CROSSTALK] Is the session with the SSAC listed? Because I just can't see it there.

ALAN GREENBERG:                    It is not, but we'll get to things that are left off in a minute.  
  
    [CROSSTALK]

JULIE HAMMER:                    ...no worries, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Ariel, what were you saying?

ARIEL LIANG:                        Yeah. Sorry, if you look at the second tab, these are the ones that are already secured spots, that these groups will meet with the ALAC, and SSAC is included there. So it's a separate question.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, fine. But let's stay on the subject, if we can. Is there anything in the first meetings, up until and including line 12, row 12, that anyone feels we should not have? Remember, they don't charge to meet with us, but it does take time, and it does take away, opportunities for other discussions.

There is no one there that people feel is not of value. Okay. Heidi, the one that concerns me most is GSC and regional VPs. Is there going to be substance there? Or is it going to be another review of what people are doing?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, Alan. For which person?

ALAN GREENBERG: Line, row number nine, GSE.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, Sally [inaudible] takes over GSE as well as DPRD, so that's something to do, you know, with regional activities, with Civil Societies, but I don't know if we want to go there, [inaudible], ICANN Learn, all of that activity.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, that isn't what was on the line that people selected, though. The line said, regional VPs, regional strategy.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm seeing Sally Costerton under global interaction strategic plan RALOs, which is correct. Where are you looking?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So you're saying the focus might not be on regional VPs, but on other aspects of things that report to Sally?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Absolutely. She just basically brings regional VPs, [inaudible] very much. [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Often they spend a half an hour not saying very much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, so basically... If you like, I could just have Sally come....

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let's assume Sally, and we'll need to decide a little bit more guidance as to what we want to talk about. Okay, fine. Again, last call, I see Olivier and Tijani. Specifically, is there anyone in that section that we do not want to have? Olivier and then Tijani, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I wanted to mention, just regarding GSE, I think it's important to speak to them, specifically for the budget item which was granted, which is the providing of some

---

funding for activities that are not related to travel. And I think that the RALOs have been asking some clarity and some clarification on what is actually being now given.

I think the sum is \$10,000, and I'm not quite sure, in fact, I don't think anybody knows, what that means, and how it could be used, etc. [CROSSTALK] question that would...

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Before we go ahead, can someone explain the ha, ha, ha, under Rinalia?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. Yes, I can explain it. So, when we had the survey, was asked people to provide suggestions for potential topics to some of these groups, and one of those comments was ha, ha, ha.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure that was worth reproducing in the summary.

ARIEL LIANG: I'm sorry. [Inaudible] the integrity of the data, so it's there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

Tijani?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Alan. Sorry, I was speaking but I was muted. Only to stress that the meeting with the GSE is very, very important for us. For several reasons. One of them, the one Olivier mentioned, but also [inaudible] of the corporation, how we can enhance this interaction between the GSE and our community and our structures? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, okay. Fine, we have made a decision that everything, we will attempt to fit in and invite everything, everyone that is above the horizontal line. Below the horizontal line, we now have information management and other tools, contractual compliance, government engagement, global communications, DPRD, which Heidi claimed was above the line, but in fact, that one didn't get much rating.

So, it's not clear we really should be inviting her with that hat in mind, although my personal preference is in fact that hat. Meeting strategy, nominating committee, ASO and IDN. Is there anyone...? Any in those sections below the line that we feel, despite the low rating, we should be talking to?

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. I think that the information management is one of the issues that we raised several times, and you particularly, Alan, when you speak about storage, about how to find information, how to find, how the information is managed inside

---

ICANN. And I think that Ashely Hayes, I think he is [inaudible]. He made a lot of progress in this [inaudible], and I think it would be good to hear from him, so that we know perhaps what has been done, and how we can use it in the future. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I presume, BPRG is related somehow to the discussions on the public interest. But I can't...

ALAN GREENBERG: It most certainly is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't think that the working group will have time to meet face to face. Have you scheduled some time for the ALAC to discuss this public interest thing?

ALAN GREENBERG: We haven't done the scheduling at all, at that point. We have asked people what we should talk about. You're one of those people. You think public interest is something we want to focus At-Large leadership on, then we need to get to that in a moment. We're not at that topic right now, however.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The reason why I ask this question is because if there isn't going to be an ALAC session on touching, at all on the public interest, then the DPRD with Sally and [inaudible] and Betsy Andrews might be a good thing to have.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Heidi, you wanted to speak?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, there is going to be an At-Large public interest working group meeting on Tuesday between 17 and 18:00.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's the public interest group. That is not necessarily the At-Large group talking about the public interests, which is I think, I believe what Olivier is asking about.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So would you like to schedule an hour or so with just At-Large? Or during...

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd like to stay on topic. All right. What I take from what I've heard plus my own personal opinion, is that I would suggest that, despite the low rating, we include DPRD in the line nine. In other words, that line nine is

---

now a wider subject than just GSE. It includes other things with Sally that is responsible for, and I think asking her what the next steps are regarding the public interest, since there has been a change of leadership is a reasonable thing to do.

And with regarding the information management, it is an exceedingly important task. I just had another example last night that frustrated the something out of me, I'll tell you about it later because I'm putting it under any other business. But I'm not convinced there is something to, worth talking about at this point.

What I would suggest, if you agree, is that I schedule a talk with Chris Gift, either one on one, or if someone else, Tijani or someone else wants to participate that's fine, and try to find out is this something really that we can have a substantive, useful discussion on, or are we just going to talk to each other again, you know, saying we need to do something?

Is that a reasonable way to proceed?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I think the right person will be Ashley and not Chris Gift.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Chris Gift's area, who we speak to is a different issue. Is that a reasonable way to go forward? I see no negatives. Tijani had his hand up and then down again.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's okay. I think it's...

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Then as an action item for me on that please. And I don't see anything else there that I think is compelling at this point. All right. Section number two is the question on ones that we already essentially have scheduled. One is with SSAC, ccNSO, registry stakeholder group, commercial stakeholder group, and GAC leadership.

Now, I thought that was a GAC meeting, not GAC leadership. Gisella or Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, yes, I'm back. That should be with GAC, I'm just double checking in my correspondence, what is that [inaudible] the GAC leadership.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I believe it is registry stakeholder group leadership, not group. I don't remember a commercial stakeholder group.



---

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, no it's registry stakeholder leadership, and the commercial stakeholder leadership.

ALAN GREENBERG: And GAC is [CROSSTALK]...

GISELLA GRUBER: No, and both of those are the GNSO groups are with the LLTs, and the GAC is with the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but the GAC is full GAC, not GAC leadership. All right, those are confirmed already. I don't think there is any reason we want to change those. Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That was an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right. Slide number three. Topics. The topics are gTLD, CCW accountability work stream two, IANA stewardship transition, registration directory services, which is really registration data directory services, or director services, I don't remember which. There are two D's actually. ALS criteria and expectations, and more effective use of mailing lists and Wikis.

---

New gTLDs is the highest one. Accountability work stream two, IANA stewardship transition, RDS ALS criteria. My personal view is, I cannot think what possibly we want to talk about on item number, line number six, IANA stewardship transition.

Is there someone who thinks we need to talk about this again? If there are people in the ALAC who think so, they haven't been paying attention, I think, which may well be true. So I see, including of those six, I see including the four with the exception of IANA stewardship transition and more effective use of mailing lists and Wikis.

That might be an interesting topic for our development day. Cheryl and Heidi note. It didn't receive a lot of comments, by the way, but we make particularly poor use of our mailing lists. Everyone agreeing with the go ahead with the four? Tijani agrees. No one saying no. Done. This topic is done.

Thank you. Is there anything that anyone wants to talk about that is not on this list? Olivier, do you believe we need a public interest session within At-Large in addition to the working group meeting?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I managed to unmute myself. Yeah, thank you Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. No, there is a working group session, I don't think we need to have an ALAC in addition to that. However, I would like to ask you, with regards to the ATLAS 2 recommendations, whether there would be some time to be able to present these and discuss these with the ALAC?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Tell us how much time you need and we'll see what we can do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I'll follow-up after that then, after this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. Have you, have we decided that we'll have a face to face meeting of the IANA issues [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we're certainly going to talk on the work stream two issues. Whether that constitutes the IANA issues group or not, or we should simply try to do it a time that would allow remote participation, I would think that would be sufficient.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: This is exactly what I mean. I don't want it to be duplicated if we have a session of the IANA issues, do we not need the discussions of those in the ALAC for the work. Otherwise, if we don't have an IANA issue meeting, yes, we have to have it on our agenda. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I feel quite strongly that we want to have this discussion in the present of the whole At-Large leadership. I think these issues are of enough importance, certainly some of them, are of enough importance that we want exposure to the whole leadership, At-Large leadership group, not just those who choose to go to the IANA issues, now retitled ICANN Evolution.

So I think labeling it as a whole group, regardless of the detailed agenda, is something that is very important. We have too many people who do not participate in those things. So, but yes, the topics will be covered, and we should try to do it to the best we can. The timing is really bad for remote participation, certainly from North America but Europe is somewhat better.

We should try to do it at a time which is not particularly awkward to the extent that we can do that. All right. Hearing no other comments of what we need, we can go on to the next item. Gisella or Heidi?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you Alan. Heidi, would you like to take over the development session?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I can [inaudible], Cheryl can you do that? I'm happy to. Okay, I'll go ahead and Cheryl can come in if she wishes. So the development session is going to be for ongoing and incoming ALAC members and liaisons. It will be held on the 9<sup>th</sup>. The official start date itself, ending at 18:00, but we have decided that the real start time will be about 20:15.

---

The format, to allow people to go to lunch at the tech center. The format will be a fish bowl, Cheryl is much better placed to tell a little bit about that. It's a very interactive format. It allows a discussion to progress. And some of the topics will be... We have unfortunately lost the information we discussed earlier. Gisella, unless you have found it?

But some of the topics will be, let's see, better listening skills. There will be some topics, I believe, RVS, Alan, I believe, that was one of them. And following that will be an ALAC dinner at the [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG:

We said RVS or new gTLDs, we would decide on the fly.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. All right. And we're going to be, staff will be sending out notices, much more advanced than last year's development session, be [inaudible] to ensure that all of the ALAC people who are invited to this will have it on their calendars, because there was a little bit of a pushback at the length of the session.

Actually, last year's session was all day, this one is basically half-day. So I think that will help as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, plus some people thought they had the day off.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. Alan, Heidi covered over things supposed [inaudible] planning. We will be using a fish bowl technique for the, particularly the discussion on either IBS or subsequent [inaudible] of the new gTLDs. And we'll prep both and see which one we'll run closer to the day, depending on how things have happened throughout the actual ICANN meeting.

There will be a warm-up exercise where ice-breaking exercise, which hopefully, will highlight some of the variety, the diversity that we have in our expectations and still some of the leaders being collaborates and working in a multicultural environment. We'll have some guided discussions which will still be in the round, in other words, large circle discussions, then we'll have specifically the fish bowl in which, towards the last session running up to around 17:30.

Also, we'll be looking at particular the timing meeting, this meeting practice and leadership skills that one would expect based on the, well the procedure and expectations of ALAC members to, for example, take leadership roles in various work groups, [inaudible], or policy development forum, either within or [inaudible] beyond ALAC. So at the end of it, we hope we will have groups that are more collaborative, certainly understanding each other more, and have a set of expectations as to how they can operate effectively.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other comments on this?

---

Next item please.

[CROSSTALK]

We are running late on time so let's try to make up some time please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Questions for the Board. Alan? Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can hear you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, questions for the Board, to the Board, is the next item.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The only items that we have at this point are questions from the Board. The two questions we've been given is, what do we, the Board and ICANN organization, have to do to make the transition work for you? And presumably, by the transition, they really mean the accountability part of, the bylaws part of the transition, not IANA.

And the second one is, what do we, Board ICANN organization and community, need to do to advance trust and confidence in what we do? I think many of us have some answers on that. That's not just what the Board does, but what ICANN does. In other words, how do we convince Senator Cruz that we're good guys? Among other things.

---

I think those are going to be interesting topics. Time management may be interesting, since we have only about an hour. Questions for the Board, we need to come up with. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And it's not quite a question from the ALAC to the Board, but I wondered whether there would be the opportunity to present the ATLAS 2 follow-up, or say a couple of words about the ATLAS 2 follow-up implementation.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we can put that in as a presentation. My inclination is to do it at the end, so that we don't end up in an extraneous discussion from Board members that does not really help us any, but if we want to highlight it, we can certainly do that in that kind of forum.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine with me, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else?

Next item please.



---

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, yes, Gisella here, sorry. Logistics, we ran through them at the beginning of the meeting, and just an additional point was what the ALT thought about having an At-Large community, ICANN 57 threat call, week of the 17<sup>th</sup> of October. Mind that we won't have an ALAC call in October.

The ALT call will be on Monday the 24<sup>th</sup> or Tuesday the 25<sup>th</sup> of October, due to go out after this meeting. And on Thursday the 20<sup>th</sup> of October, we have the pre-ICANN 57 policy webinars, two of which will be held on the same day. The usual format, 10 UTC and 19:00 UTC. So your thoughts on having this At-Large ICANN 57 prep call, to prep all of the At-Large travelers, basically using the travel list that we have, just the email list, with all of the At-Large community members attending, to see whether we need to prep them, not only what to expect from the high interest topics, but also what to expect from the At-Large schedule, and to run through the schedule, and to prepare them as much as possible.

For the policy forum, we saw that for the four-day meeting, people didn't quite know which sessions they had to attend, and that wasn't even going as far as the At-Large community. We could just know, narrow that down to what is supposed to be the ALAC members and regional leaders. So do we need to prepare them for the seven-day very long meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will note that this meeting is effectively not much longer than our previous ones. Perhaps a day later. I think it would be reasonable, I think by then we should have firm schedules and agendas set up, or

---

pretty firm or at least, if not the detailed agendas, at least know what topics we're covering. I think it's an opportunity to review them, to give people some homework.

We don't tend to have really good attendance at either the ICANN prep calls, or our prep calls, but I think it's something that we can certainly try to do and see if it has any effect on how well people are prepared for the actual meetings.

I will not be able to attend it, so someone else will have to run that call. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And if you, when you have the time for that, could you go back to the previous item please, the agenda for the Board, if it's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please, let's finish this one and I'll go back to it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Prep meeting, everyone support? Anyone object? Everyone object? No comments. [CROSSTALK] support. Yes, Heidi, go ahead.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, so basically [inaudible] the idea of having León be the chair of that call. I'm asking the chairs of some of these meetings to prevent what they plan on getting out of these meetings. So not only a presentation on what the meeting is about, but also their aim. So it gives them a little bit of time to think about what they want to do in that meeting before they actually get there.

ALAN GREENBERG: You said the chairs of those meetings. Which chairs are we talking about?

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, the various working group chairs. Or did you want this just to be on the ALAC call? Or did you want... Because you had invited, you had informed us that you would like to invite not only the ALAC, but the RALO leaders as well to this call on the 17<sup>th</sup>.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well yes, this is a prep for the At-Large leadership group. Most of the time we meet as a total group. There is no reason to not include the full group.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And then also, so the people leading the session in, for example, the At-Large leadership session as well as those who are leading some of the working groups that are going to be upheld. Perhaps those people could...

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So you're talking about the people within At-Large who will be leading discussions.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, yes. [CROSSTALK] Sorry about that. And then the other point about that is that the policy, the pre-ICANN 57 policy webinars will be taking place on October 20<sup>th</sup>, and I think that that should be mandatory for everyone. So staff can send out a note really urging people to attend one of those calls.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can but say the words.

HEIDI ULLRICH: But try. Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, back to you on the Board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I was going to suggest that if we needed a controversial topic or something that would generate a little bit of discussion, if we had some spare time during our hour with the Board, in other words, if we were to make this 10 hours with the Board, we would be able to perhaps mention, or ask

---

the Board about their point of view regarding a next round of new gTLDs. [CROSSTALK] it's quite likely that other parts of ICANN would be speaking to them about this and trying to lobby in one direction, I think it might be, I suggest that it might be a good idea to start telling the Board, quite clearly, about what our point of view is from the beginning. [CROSSTALK] to repeat this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Assuming we have a point of view. That's one of the discussions that we're going to be having. There is going to be, as I've said, and some have said, enormous pressure to do something. There is probably pressure within our own group to do IDNs. There might be pressure within our group to do released TLDs in developing areas.

Are we really sure that we really want to say nothing until everything is done? I'm not 100% sure that if we go to our community, that's what the answer would be. If we have a strong position, certainly we can present it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

It depends really on the timing. So it's a meeting with the Board that took place after the ALAC session that will be discussing this face to face. Then of course, we can read it to the Board what the conclusion about face to face discussions has been. That was really, whatever that position is. I'm not presuming that it's a no, no, no, or a yes, yes, or a yes but, or a no but.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm just worried that if we take a very rigid position, we may get bypassed, and I would prefer to be part of the discussion then simply to be the people that are ignored because we're simply saying no, under no conditions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier. There is a difference between saying we're going to go for this and nothing else, and the one where we touch on the subject, and we say, well, this is our current position. And the concern is if we don't raise that, they will come back to us and say, we come to see the ALAC and you guys have not had any questions for us, and the ALAC doesn't deal with any policy whatsoever.

I do think we need to hit them on the head with policy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The Board will typically not answer questions like, what are your feelings on this? But, let's, we'll add that to the current list of topics that we'll look at.

Back to you Gisella, or Heidi, or whoever. I think we may be finished with that item [CROSSTALK] on ICANN planning. We are 65 minutes into the meeting and 20 minutes late, past our agenda. So I hope we can go on. [CROSSTALK]

Next item is At-Large review. We have five minutes allocated. Holly is not on the call, Cheryl is. Do you have any comments?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Inaudible] Cheryl for the record. Yes, the reason that they call for the At-Large review working party, ICANN's Board is up to speed on the responses to the survey so far. Whilst it was recognized that we do need to push out, and some are saying push out already from the LACRALO [inaudible] promoting, for example.

To get more of the surveys done, particularly for the [inaudible] as well as English, we've got about 100 or surveys, which early days, I don't think that's bad at all. And there are some both high level interest things to fix that [inaudible] chairing with us in the Hyderabad meeting, as well as some specific drill downs which will be in greater detail than we had presented in our [inaudible] call earlier this week.

There is going to be an in greater detail, is because some of the analysis will be available by then. The other thing is, of course, Hyderabad itself is going to be an opportunity for us to encourage more people to fill out the survey, with people who have already committed themselves to get on the plane and [inaudible] more than a week of ICANN [inaudible].

Might also get them to be doing the survey as well. But that's the five minutes. Do you need any more from me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Any comments, questions? Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I'm concerned by the numbers that were given to us, in that there were, indeed, more than 100 responses, but if I understand correctly, only a

---

third of these came from people in the At-Large community? And that was the, what I learned there, I thought, wow, we really need to push, and the aim or the hope from the consultants was that we would get at least 100 responses from the At-Large community, because the current number is very small, it seems.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, an interesting question which I don't know the answer to is, how many ALAC members and regional leaders have submitted. That's 25 people alone. You know, [CROSSTALK] if we look at incomings. So, I think the push has to be at a number of different levels. Anyone else?

Seeing no more comments. Next item, BCEC and BMS BC, reports from Julie and Tijani. Who would like to go first? Who can unmute themselves? Go right ahead, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you. We've had one joint meeting with the BMS BC, we've two BC B meetings, and Cheryl, Ariel, and I, and Terri Agnew have had a preliminary session with Kim Bower. Just to summarize where we're currently at, we have finalized our BC's private conduct, and we made a decision that we would seek formal commitment by email of all members and alternatives to that code of conduct.

We're still waiting for two members to signify their commitment, and that is recorded on the website with some link to each person's email. We have [inaudible] attend to that requirements [inaudible] and Tijani [inaudible] by email. We have gone back with some feedback on the



---

timeline to Tijani and [inaudible], basically saying that we recommend taking out the lines associated with [inaudible] for reference, from the timeline, because [inaudible] is now the call for references as part of the applications.

So a separate call for references that are meant to be made, we should have all of the information from the submission of data [inaudible] applications. That being the case, those two line items can be removed from the timeline, but the committee has agreed to the timeline I've presented for the remainder of the [inaudible], and as a separate [inaudible] formally notified to [inaudible] yesterday, which I have drafted operational procedures from guidelines, and they have been circulated a couple of times to our committee that we're meeting with today.

We had just a couple of minor updates to make to them to finalize them. The final draft has now been sent out to the committee for their approval by 23:59 UTC next Monday. I don't expect there to be any real changes required to them. And following that, I should be in a position to submit them to do on Tuesday.

My understanding is that the ALAC needs to approve those operational procedures and guidelines. I believe the [inaudible] requirements [inaudible] to approve. But with no ALAC call in October, I'm just querying how that's going to happen possibly with an added session circulation [inaudible] call of approval, but perhaps come back to that at the end of what I want to say.

---

The final thing that I just want to update you on is the session that Cheryl and I, Ariel, and Terri, had with Kim Bower, was absolutely brilliant, and we're going to adopt the NomCom, or a derivation of the NomCom, tool which looks really excellent. The committee has agreed to that at its meeting yesterday.

Following the session with Kim Bower, I went through in vivid detail, compared to all of the NomCom tools against the expression of interest [inaudible] time for ALAC, or for At-Large, and just to see that [inaudible] during the time we've been on this call, I've just seen but haven't had a chance to [inaudible] to have actually already implemented in the software, in the tool, the feedback and the changes that are suggested needed to be made to adapt it to ALAC.

I haven't had a chance to look at it yet, but I'm just so interested, and he worked with Ariel to do that. And I did send the email sufficiently to make that [inaudible], but he thought the world of Ariel's capabilities in being able to pick up some very complex technical steps, and some approaches very, very quickly.

So [inaudible] has done some great work, but I haven't had a chance to look at it yet. So it sounds like Ariel is going to be well-placed to support during all of the fine-tunings that truly is. So, that's about it from me. I think we've made some good progress, and we've still got quite a bit to do, but I'm feeling much more confident after I made yesterday in the progress we've made there, that will be quite well able to make the [inaudible] go on. Thanks Alan.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Julie. In terms of the approval process, what we'll do is once you have the guidelines finalized and ready for presentation to the ALAC, we will present them to the ALAC, we'll give them several working days, several weekdays to read them and send any comments, and presumably there is nothing substantial that cannot be addressed, we'll do a consensus call.

So, once we're past the few days of comments, I think that you can presume that even though they're not technically approved at that point, they will be approved, and you can proceed and start the implementation at that point. So, essentially within less than a week after you present them, we should have them, something that you can work with as tools for your business.

In terms of the tool, the application tool, I've got about four decades of a history of, when I test things, I find bugs no one else does. So I would be glad to be a guinea pig for your questionnaire if you wish. I've already gone on record saying I'm not submitting an application this time, so there is no conflict of interest. If you want me to, let me know.

Anything else? Any other questions for Julie before we go to Tijani?

I have one question, actually. I know people have signed the conflict of interest statement. Do they really understand that you will tolerate no leaks? And that if there are leaks, to the best of your ability, you will take action on them? For the record, we have had leaks in the past, and they have serious implications. Thank you.

---

JULIE HAMMER: I'm not sure that I've expressed it quite so strongly. But perhaps what I might do is, at our next meeting, I might take that message back. That when I reported to the ALT that the ALT stressed that that is the approach we should take.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Any other comments? And Tijani, it's all yours.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. For the BMS BC, we had, so far, only one meeting, joint meeting with the BCEC, Julie spoke about. Our next meeting will be tomorrow. I hope that all of the members will be present.

We invited the members as well as the [inaudible], and Julie will be on the call too. Alan also will be on the call. So everyone will be... Cheryl also will be on the call.

What we will do tomorrow, will be the discussion, modification if any, and approval of the guidelines, and the timeline. For your information, the timeline has been already approved by the BCEC, so now it is to the BMS BC to give the final say about it.

As for the guidelines, I sent both the guidelines and the timeline to the members, so that they read them before it was, I think, two days' ago. So that they read them before we come to the meeting, so that we may make a lot of progress in this regard.

---

I hope, I think we will have a good progress. And I hope we will have it. So Alan, probably on Monday, you will receive the BMS BC guidelines approved, so that you may initiate the, how to say, the consensus call, or the [CROSSTALK] discussion, yeah, discussion about it.

And as for the timelines, if the BMS BC approve it, it will be official. I think I don't have other things to say, because we are not, we don't have the same time constraints than Julie, then the BCEC, since our work will start really when they have done their work. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Other than approving the timeline, which is your first job. Yes, thank you very much. You will have my comments on what you sent me by tomorrow. Sorry I didn't get to it before then, but you will have it before I go to asleep tonight. Any other questions on the Board selection process?

Onto the next agenda item. CCWG budget and process. This is a, well you've all seen the emails, and there has been a little bit of a discussion related to the GNSO statement. My recommendation, at this point, is that when... There is currently a consensus call that is ending in an hour, or something like, about an hour from now, on the, basically saying we support the budget and the budget process that was described in those documents.

I believe that the issues raised by the GNSO in their items, one to four, are effectively implied by the process, but they're not explicit. And I would support me, when I submit the document, when I submit the

---

proposal, say we support the intent of those GNSO recommendations. Not to say that, you know, we couldn't write and approve a statement here, but essentially there has been very little comment saying we don't approve, we don't agree with them, and I think an explicit statement to the Board is relatively important.

There are substantive issues. On issue number five, I do not believe that we should be directing what the CCWG work stream group talks about, but I do have concern that a huge amount of money could be wasted on legal consultation, on issues which they shouldn't be talking about to begin with.

Now, we may or may not be able to stop them from talking about it, but I would like to put constraints on what they do in terms of providing funding. So my feeling, it's not a very strong one, but my inclination is to, when I submit the statement, the fact that the ALAC has approved the budget, add those statements of support, or modified support for the GNSO items, one to five.

One to four is strong support, and on item number five, moderate support. Olivier, go ahead.

By the way, to summarize, in general, we've gotten great support. Tijani has said, in previous call, that he believes that if we are going to make a statement, we should write our own words and not just support someone else's statement. We have in the past, supported other statements that have been made, so I'm not sure if it breaks new ground.

---

But I don't think we have the time at this point to do that through any other mechanism. So it's either be silent, or say we support the intent of those things. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I have a real concern with number five. I think I have expressed this. How does everyone here feel about SOs and ACs dictating the work that would be done in a cross community working group? Dictating to the level of saying, oh no, we are going to restrict your money on this item, so you can't have that support on this item because we don't want you to deal with it.

That's something I'm a little concerned about because you can then, by starving some processes of cash, you are creating a precedent here. Starving some processes, you just make sure that those processes will never succeed, nor happen. And that's probably not the way we want to move forward. Hence, the reason why I was a firm supporter in the CWG that it would cost how much it would cost, and that's the bottom line. It will just cost that.

Now, of course, it doesn't stop the chairs of the CCWG and staff to look closely at costs, and to on occasion say, well, we've got one option which is going to cost this amount, and the other option is going to cost less. We should go for the one that costs less. But having a blanket that, a blanket, not a ban, but a blanket note on the one of the work streams saying, oh, if this work stream goes in this direction, it's going to cost too much, therefore we're not funding it.

---

It's not going to go in that direction, is something that really worries me.  
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Just to respond. I'm happy to leave out number five altogether. So, you know, I don't feel strongly about it. The reason I feel comfortable doing what I suggested, however, is what we are really saying, and we can word it this way, is that we do not want money spent on following paths that were not in the charter provided by work stream one to work stream two, and that has been supported by the chartering organizations.

We approved, as a chartering organization, the work stream one report, which included the mandate for work stream two. And the discussions that we're taking on right now of should we move where ICANN is incorporated? Should we change where it is headquartered? I believe are out of scope, and that is why I feel comfortable in making that restriction, but I feel equally comfortable being completely silent on it. Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

No, that was an old hand. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

What's the group feel? Silent on item number five? If people are uncomfortable with it, then I'm happy to leave it off. Tijani?



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. Tijani speaking. I do support what Olivier said. I have the same fear. It is, as I said in other calls, we, as a chartering group, you said something which is not right, Alan. In the report, in the final report of the CCWG work stream one, we gave the tasks for the jurisdiction subgroup.

And we said that this group has to contemplate all the layers of the jurisdiction, and they are all mentioned, including incorporation and implementation. So, we are tasked by the work stream one to address it.

Second point, very important. If you want, if I understand your point, I understand you don't want ICANN to move from California, and I agree with you. How we have to address that, we have to address that from inside the group. We are represented in the group, and anyone who wants to prevent it, to happen, or to prevent our group to spend money on it, we have to be inside the group and to say no.

We have to be numerous to say, we will stay in California and that's all. We don't [CROSSTALK], we don't need anything.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We are very short of time, and there are some other substantive issues we need to discuss. I'm quite happy to leave that one out, and I'm sorry if I mis-remembered what was in the work stream two, work stream one report on this item in work stream two. Cheryl, quickly.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very briefly. Cheryl for the record. I actually, my memory of the clear recommendations on jurisdiction out of work stream one is more in line with yours, Alan than with Tijani. And in fact, we, I thought, were very clear that we are not encouraging re-litigation of matters that were looking at jurisdiction, but rather looking at where in those layers of jurisdiction that may be a need to look at, whether or not alternative jurisdictions or alternate mechanisms to ensure that it is problems regarding jurisdiction are minimized.

So Tijani, so I disagree with the incorporation one is scheduled. But doesn't matter, they've put it in. [Inaudible], and we can use that bit of leverage if we need to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm going to take an executive ruling on this. There is a clear belief that we are in agreement with what is said in one to four, and in fact, from my point of view, I believed it was already implicit, then I will mention one to four. We do not have agreement on five. We'll not mention five at this point.

Next item... Yes?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The final point, a final point please. Why we said that this report went to four? Why don't we write them in our statement? It will be our position. Why should we support the positions of others? [Inaudible] as the GNSO? We are two chartering organizations.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani, the reason is, if we're going to put new words to it, we have to take it, make it the decision of the ALAC. We cannot do that, I don't feel that, I can do that tonight unilaterally and write it tomorrow morning. We did, I did put out a question on whether we support the intent of one to four, and the answer seemed to be universally yes.

So, we can either be completely silent, but I believe the issues need reinforcing, because if my reading is wrong, and they are not implicit in the original document, then I do believe they are worth saying. But I don't think we have the time. This is going to be considered by the Board quickly. It's already much later than it should have been done.

It should have been done before the work stream two projects actually started working. So I think time constraints are against us at this point.

Next item is the process to appoint liaisons. All of the nominations are closed for two of the positions, the dot [inaudible] and for the GAC liaison, we have competition. The selection committee will be meeting next Monday to discuss this, and I'd like to take a quick poll of this group, and I don't want large discussions, I just want a poll.

The past selection committees have made recommendations to the ALAC to appoint a certain person to a job. They have not provided options. The selection committee could give, could pass on the whole list of people who have applied, who have expressed interest. They could pass on a subset, or can pass on a single candidate. Is there any strong feelings in this group about which path they should take, if after looking at the resumes, it is not obvious which path?

---

In other words, do you believe the selection committee should side more on making a decision as past ones have? Or in giving the ALAC a decision part in the process? If anyone has any quick opinions on it, I would value them, in consultation.

I do note that all of the ALAC ALT members are part of the selection committee. So you can certainly be silent now and weigh in later, but I'm just interested if anyone has any thoughts on this. It will help me guide how I present it to the selection committee. Anyone have any input?

Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I am not on Adobe Connect. So may I speak?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, you may.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry. Okay, thank you very much, Alan. Except if we have two very good candidates for the same position, perhaps we can give two choices for the ALAC, but in general, we will select, we will give the recommendation to select one candidate for one position.

But if we have really two excellent candidates for the same position, yes we can give the choice to ALAC. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Then you will provide your input on or before Monday, whether you think we have more than one candidate. But we'll not discuss that here. Heidi, you have your hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Quickly, Alan, should be, people positioned that only had one nomination. Should they be approved by acclamation?

ALAN GREENBERG: They certainly should. We actually have a rule saying that, right now, feel free to go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Excellent. The congratulations...

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I thought I had already said that to you, but perhaps not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just to make it formal. Do you wish to say congratulations to everyone?  
[CROSSTALK] Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm congratulating our liaisons. Our ccNSO liaison, Maureen. I'm congratulating our GNSO liaison, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And am I missing somebody? [CROSSTALK] ...SSAC liaison, Julie. How could I forget?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hooray for gender diversity, just to let you know.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're not doing real well on gender diversity on liaisons so far.  
But luckily, in the direction opposite from the normal trend.  
Heidi, new hand, old hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Old hand, all right. We'll do item number 10, any other business, and then we'll go into a very short in-camera session. There is a meeting next week with the various chairs of the ACs and SOs, and the Board working group on registration data directory services.

The reason for the meeting... Now this is an interesting group. This group was created by the Board last July, July 2015. For the life of me, I cannot find any records that they've met or done anything. And although in the Board documents, the charter of the group is mentioned multiple times, both in the Board governance committee minutes, and in the Board minutes, I cannot find out what the charter is.

It doesn't seem to exist anywhere other than in some secret document that isn't on the web, or it may be there and hidden in plain sight. In

---

any case, this group, that was my comment on access to data on the ICANN website. There are thousands of words on this subcommittee, but the actual charter on what they're supposed to be doing, I can't find.

In any case, the subject of the meeting is, the Board has heard rumors that some people in the committee think that a WHOIS review team being convened right now is a bloody waste of time, given that we have several other groups looking at WHOIS issues. And that, to have another review team look at it again, seems to be a waste of community time, since in general, it's going to be the same people.

My suggestion to them is exactly the one that I'm going to make on my own personal behalf, is exactly the one that I made to the comment when it was mandated and the bylaws that we had to do this review. That I believe we should have staff do a review of how well the implementations have been done on the first WHOIS review team, and do an honest one, not patting themselves on the back.

And convene a group of volunteers of people who are very knowledgeable of WHOIS review team recommendations. And have them pass judgment on the staff review, and that's it. The only part of the WHOIS review that I think it bears, is worthy of doing now, is reviewing how well the last one was implemented, not creating new recommendations on where to go forward.

So that is certainly my, going to be my recommendation. I'm interested in knowing, and you don't have to do it today, because the meeting is not until next week, if you have any thoughts on that suggestion, then I

---

welcome them. If anyone has any immediate comments, go right ahead, but I don't think they're really necessary, I just wanted to tell you the meeting is coming up and the position I plan to take on it.

Comments? Nothing? Done. If we can go in camera, I don't believe there is anyone on this call who is not included in an in camera session. Yes, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier speaking. [CROSSTALK] Muted? Where is muted? Now I should be okay. Are you hearing me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. You didn't ask for any other, other business, and I wanted to touch on...

ALAN GREENBERG: I did at the beginning when I said is there anything to add to the agenda, but go ahead, if you have any other business.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Alan. It's Olivier. And I'm hoping that we can go through this quickly. ATLAS 2 recommendations, which I mentioned a little bit earlier, there are a number of them that require the ALAC,



---

sorry, the ALT's input. And I'm hoping that I could, and we probably don't need to have the answer right away on this call, since we're so short on time, but I would like to raise four points, or at least three, with you and with the ALT.

First is recommendation number six. Ariel, are you able to display this on the screen please?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, before you go ahead. Is there anyone on this call who has to leave in the next 10 minutes? Okay, you have five minutes, Olivier. Just five.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Alan. Okay. So recommendation six, is whether the ALAC should follow the GNSO's example, and require ALAC members and liaisons to state any changes to their SOIs at the beginning of every ALAC monthly conference call. Because recommendation six effectively states that ICANN's multistakeholder model should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants to declare and update existing and potential conflicts of interest each time a vote takes place, or consensus is sought.

So are there any strong thoughts in the ALAC, in the ALT, about this, going either way, in favor or against?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: My preference is to remind people periodically that they must update their statements when there are changes, and not when they're not necessarily asked in front of every meeting, where, in general, consensus is not sought, and decision are not taken anyway.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're speaking about the ALAC meeting, the monthly ALAC call. And decisions, I hope, are made during some of the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Occasionally, not often actually. We tend to do more things online.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so either way, if we present this, that would be okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani speaking. I am comfortable with reminding everyone each call, that they have to update their SOI. It doesn't make any harm.

ALAN GREENBERG: In any case, I don't think we are in disagreement with the words there. The implementation may vary. Next item.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Next, recommendation 36, whether the ALAC should discuss with David Olive, and I believe that we are meeting with David

---

Olive at ICANN 57, about the possibility of holding calls with other SOs and ACs in between ICANN meetings.

The thing is a little different [inaudible] conference calls with other ACs and SOs in between ICANN meetings to improve collaboration and engagement? [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have already stated publicly, I think the concept of asking permission to do that is ludicrous. There is nothing stopping us from doing that if the two groups want to do it, and I think that's a given that, if anyone has had an idea where they wanted to meet with another group, and the other group wanted to meet with us in a teleconference, then they have no one to blame but themselves for not raising the issue.

I do not think that needs ALAC approval, and certainly doesn't need David Olive's approval.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I agree with you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. So no discussion with David Olive about this, but we proceed forward with this recommendation and say that the ALAC is going to take this on.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it's a no-brainer. I don't foresee a lot of meetings. Getting the other groups to agree that we actually have something substantive to hold a teleconference over, you know, that shouldn't be handled in a more ad-hoc way, but I have...

If there is a need for it, we should do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks Alan. Olivier speaking. Recommendation 41, whether the ALAC should discuss with the global stakeholder engagement team, which is the reason why we are speaking to them, about raising external funds. So in addition to the envelope that was raised in special requests, which is one of the topics that we might raise with GSE when we meet with them, the other one was the possibility of raising external funds, and getting sponsors.

So effectively being helped by GSE in raising external funds and getting sponsors. And whether a taskforce in At-Large might be needed to establish, to be established to, okay, let's start again.

Might be needed to tackle sponsorship issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I were king, which I am not, I would say it's a reasonable thing to raise with them, and if they are not in vehement disagreement, then we handle it on an ad-hoc basis where there is a requirement, not create a taskforce. That would be my recommendation.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Alan, it's Olivier speaking. The only concern here is the, it does say here, including the development of a sponsor database. Because what we have noticed, or what several people have noticed, is that RALOs are, some RALOs have a good relationship with sponsors, some don't, and we do not have the ability to pass on that knowledge of sponsors into...

A bit like having a CRM, customer relationship with sponsors.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I suggest on all of these items, that you send these four items out to the ALAC for discussion on the list first, post them on a Wiki, accept comments, and that at an upcoming meeting, perhaps Hyderabad or the next teleconference afterwards, we discuss them with the ALAC.

I don't think [CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...done that for two years and we haven't had any input on them...

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, targeted, four items. If there are no comments, then they're agreeing with you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, these will be sent out anyway by Hyderabad. So, okay, understood. I will follow-up by email. Next finally, the reference, the recommendation number 40, was it Ariel? [CROSSTALK]

---

ARIEL LIANG: Olivier, I don't think that you need to discuss that item.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine. That's all then. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Can we now stop the recording and move to an in-camera session?

GISELLA GRUBER: We're just going to get the recording started again, just bear with me for a second, thank you.

Recording has started again, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Gisella. The ALT met in a brief session to review the process that we'll be following to seek nominations and appointments for the ALAC leadership team for the coming year. And there was a brief discussion of some of the possible options that the ALAC would have.

And with this, we've completed the agenda. I thank everyone for staying. We're 23 minutes over, which is somewhat unusual for these meetings. I appreciate everyone staying with us, and wish you a good rest of the day, evening, or whatever part of the day it is. Thank you.

---

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**