TERRI AGNEW:	One moment, please. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC Monthly Teleconference on Tuesday, the 20th of December, 2016 at 21:00 UTC.
	On the call today we have Barrack Otieno, Wafa Dahmani, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Seun Ojedeji, Oliver Crépin-Leblond, León Sanchez, Holly Raiche, Sherdeep Rayamajhi, Andre Kolesnikov, Alan Greenberg, Yrjö Lansipuro, Glenn McKnight, Marita Moll, Julie Hammer, Javier Rua-Jovet, Maureen Hilyard, Judith Hellerstein, Sébastien Bachollet, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Kaili Kan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alberto Soto, Aida Noblia, and Harold Arcos.
	We have listed apologies from Veronica Cretu and Gisella Gruber.
	From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yesim Nazlar and myself, Terri Agnew.
	Our French interpreters today are Claire and Isabelle. Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David. Our Russian interpreters today are Galina and Ekaterina.
	I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes but for our interpreters. With this, I'll turn it back over to you, Alan. Please, begin.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. The agenda is being shown on the screen and is on the wiki. Does anyone have any comments or any other items? I'll

note Rinalia is on the call, but we do not have an item for Rinalia to speak in. if Rinalia would like some time, we do have enough time to allow for that. Not hearing her.

TERRI AGNEW: Alan, we do have a hand up from Sébastien.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know, I understand that. Okay, Rinalia says she's just listening today. Thank you. Sébastien, over to you. We can't hear you yet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello. I guess now you can hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can hear you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I have not reviewed the agenda, but I wanted to add in Any Other Business if possible today just to start the discussion about the question of mail and domain name transfer. I think it's something we may need to do something for end user specifically.

I say that because I read some issue on that, and I got myself some troubles and it's maybe one of the reasons I am raising that now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you repeat what the subject is?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, it's mail and domain name transfer. That's not the same, but how you –

ALAN GREENBERG: Mail and –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Domain name. When you want to transfer a domain name from one registrar to another and when you want to change your mail provider or your mail whatever, how we deal with that. That could be something useful for end users.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I've added [inaudible]

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And the other point is that, do we have a topic about the Auction Proceeds Working Group, or Cross-Community Working Group?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we do not have an item on that. If you'd like to, we can add –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Then if we can add that to Any Other. Yes, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure what the issue is, but we will gladly add it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I can answer your question if you want now. It is an issue that the –

ALAN GREENBERG: No, might as well wait.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll try to make sure everyone stays on time so we actually have time to discuss it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, hearing nothing else – I'm assuming that's an old hand – we will go on. We'll accept the agenda with the AOBs added, and go on to action items. Heidi has put zero minutes there, so I'm presuming there

are no action items which require the attention of the ALAC. Is that correct, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Only – just to have Sébastien, you and Olivier take a look at them. There are a few that are open with your names on them. And then there's one on a webinar with the new person taking over from Alan Grogan. So, we can talk about when and how you'd like that new person [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Let us talk about that on the Chair's call tomorrow. I don't think we need to discuss timing of a webinar here, unless someone feels that it's of great interest to everyone. Seeing no hands, hearing nothing, then I will go on to the next item of At-Large policy development. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Alan, just to say –

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, just to say that the action item where my name was was done immediately during the Hyderabad meeting, and it was set up I guess. If

not, please remind me what I'm supposed to do, but I guess it was done. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. For all the statements that are in progress, we have three that are being voted on by the ALAC, and then just a reminder for all the ALAC members on the call to please cast your votes for the following three statements.

One is the draft PTI FY18 Operating Fund and Budget. The deadline is tonight at 23:59 UTC. And then the next one is on the Continued Data-Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Draft Report, and the deadline is tomorrow. The third one is the proposed ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the deadline is the day after tomorrow.

So please, vote on these three ALAC statements. Then we also have one that's being commented on by the At-Large community. That's on the updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process, IRP. León just posted the draft statement on the wiki, and I invite all of you to take a look at it and comment.

Closed [hearing] for the At-Large internal comment will be January the 2nd, so we'll give you plenty of time over the break. If you have no other things to do, then you're welcome to read this draft statement. It's pretty brief.

And then also for another public comment is identify technology health indicator definitions. Yrjö has volunteered to take a look at that public comment and possibly draft a statement on that, so we'll remind him to post that on the wiki. The public comment close date is January the 9th. I don't have any other things.

ALAN GREENBERG: By Yrjö has a chance on the EURALO call just before this, Yrjö did note that he agreed to do this but he also said he would like some other people to work with. So, if there's anyone else who would like to work with Yjrö, please let him know.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks for the note, Alan. Thats all for the public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Yrjö, you're certainly allowed to identify people yourself and ask them to help explicitly. Anything else on public comment statements? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we will go on to the next item. And we are ahead of time, big time. ALS applications.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan. Just a very brief update here. Right now, we have a total of 211 At-Large structures. We have two from AFRALO: the Libyan Internet Society and the Kenya ICT Action Network. Those votes will be starting on the 2nd of January, and then we have several that are either in

regional advice, being awaited for or staff are processing them. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent. Any comments or questions? Glenn says, "Don't forget the unaffiliated. North America now has 18 non-affiliated members. It's actually growing quickly." Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to ask about – the regional advice is awaited for, and it had a series of websites. Were we supposed to send additional advice? We had, for example, [inaudible] news for APRALO. We had accepted [inaudible] news and I just wondered what's the regional advice that's being awaited for now that we have every one of those ALSes, their websites are up. Just some confirmation on that, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen, I'm sorry I'm not actually doing these regional advice, so I can take an action item from Nathalie to respond to that. And Alan, just on Glenn's [plate], if I may.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I'm wondering if given the increasing number of individuals At-Large is getting, should we start noting these on the ALAC page as well? How many per month, etc., or is that a little bit premature?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think it's premature at this point, but if anyone feels strongly, we should be noting it. When it's in three digits, I think we should definitely cite it. When it's in four digits, we have to. My personal opinion is at this point, it would be a little bit premature, but I'm willing to take advice from anyone. Glenn is curious how many unaffiliated other RALOs have, EURALO and APRALO. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think at the moment APRALO only has – I'm going to say there or four. I'd have to double check, but we are expecting more in the near future. A great deal more, actually, like the other RALOs. Alan, I'm going to disagree with you.

I think it would be useful if it's not too onerous for us to show the growth – region by region – of our unaffiliated members, and I guess I'm biased by the ongoing discussions we'll be having over the next few months based on some of the recommendations from the ALAC review interim report. I just want to counter your proposal to not do anything. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's exactly the reasons I was suggesting not doing anything. If you look at the numbers, and particularly the number over time for North America, it stagnated at five for about seven years, plus or minus one.

That's the reason that I'm not sure we want to boast about it until we see nice, steady growth and significant numbers. I suspect the information will be used against us, not for us. We can have that discussion. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Just to let you know that EURALO Individuals Association – which is the way by which EURALO has individual members – has 22 members currently listed on their website, but I'm aware of more signing up.

And I was going to suggest perhaps an alternative, which is that in our agendas, we do have a link to the list of RALOs, and the list of members in RALOs. We could have just a pointer to identical pages that will just list people.

So, we don't actually need to say how many more individual members we have, there could just be a pointer in the agenda to the EURALO Individuals Association webpage that lists members, and the wiki page for North America that lists members, and the one in Asia Pacific.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think at the very least, we should certainly on the agenda item on ALS applications, since it really is more than applications, it also says the current status, we should generalize that to ALS and individual

members, and in both cases list the numbers in each of the five regions, or each of the five regions that have them, in additional to the global total.

So, I think we'll do a revamp on the agenda item if nothing else. That's a good idea. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. If we go to this type of detail, then may we ask the number of members of each ALS? In Europe, we need to have equality of treatment of ALS, and I am seeing already a tendency to have one ALSes, more ALSes than the other. And we need to take care of 211 ALSes the same way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. I'll note that in the ALS criteria and expectations work that is ongoing, there is a requirement for an annual or regular report, which includes the number of members. So, we will have that information going forward. At the moment, we have no clue.

Anything else on this agenda item, agenda item five on ALS and now individual members? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we will go on to item number six. That is reports –

Someone needs to be muted. Whoever is washing dishes, just mute themselves. Thank you.

Next item is item number six on reports from working groups, RALOs, liaisons and any other reports. They are all filed electronically. Does

anyone on behalf of their organization or their position want to make any comments at this meeting? Nobody has anything that needs to be focused on? I think Cheryl has an item that has to be mentioned with regarding GNSO and their staff. Would Cheryl like me to mention it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I'm trying to come off mute. I'm babysitting now, and I was actually trying to type, but that's alright. We'll just have to have cartoon background noise and a little girl. Yes, there is a very significant change in the lineup to the GNSO staff.

As we've noted over many months now, Nathalie and Terri have been taking more and more of the role. That was fine and we all understood that it's a lot more work than it used to be, and now we know there was a cunning plan. Because after forever, really, Glen is retiring. So, an institution as far as I'm concerned has come to an end. I mean obviously, the girls will do a brilliant job. I note that we'll take at least two – I suspect probably more – able bodied and highly talented women to take up and do what Glen did for so many years solo.

It is almost beyond imagination how the GNSO will be the GNSO we know without her managing it so effectively and efficiently, but I would suggest, Alan, that a note of congratulations, job well done, and let's make sure we stay in contact does indeed go as a formal note from the At-Large Advisory Committee through to Glen, who I personally am going to miss dearly, and I hope we don't lose contact.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If we could have an action item for that. On a personal level, I sat on the GNSO as liaison for eight years. I cannot imagine someone more competent than Glen It's not to belittle any other ICANN staff, but Glen – who goes back to the DNSO before the GNSO – was both special in a personal way and in a professional way that I think she's going to be dearly missed.

But I can say more about that at some other point. We have a speaker list. Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to briefly note that ccNSO next year have their review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, can't you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can. We heard a beep, and then suddenly silence. Go ahead, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alright. I just wanted to make note that ccNSO has their review next year, and they will be able to benefit from our experience when they

undergo their review. But yes, they're starting their processes now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can they benefit from our experience by simply saying, "No, we don't want one?"

MAUREEN HILYARD: I don't know whether they've considered that option.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, thank you very much, Maureen. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. First of all, I'd like to say that I really grief Glen is retiring now. I didn't work a lot with her, just during the [inaudible] working group, and I can agree that she's a special person, and I really – I don't know. Can we please clone some people so that they never retire?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have cloned Glen. Hadn't you noticed? Not a clone, but it's close.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: You have gone very quiet, Tijani. We can barely hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I said that I know that Gisella may be a copy of Glen, but she's not. Glen is wonderful. Gisella is a special person also, so really, I really regret that Glen is retiring. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Last comment to Glen, and then we'll go on.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Just for the clarification, it's not me, it's Glen with one N who's retiring. Just to make sure there's no confusion for those who are talking about it.

Just very quickly, NARALO update: we implemented this year a semi and annual report back to the membership, so I encourage the other RALOs to look at our report on how we're being transparent, and more than happy to use our template or ask any questions on it.

The second thing is we had two tribal ambassadors in Hyderabad, and thank you so much, Maureen, for being fully part of the process of selection and also being the mentor to Valerie Fast Horse and April Tinhorn.

Thirdly, we are being very transparent and documenting every process in terms of the agenda and logistics for our General Assembly coming up with ARIN. ARIN is one of the RIRs, one of the five, and one thing that's

unique about ARIN, their geography includes the Caribbean, so there are five fellowships that are also available for people who are part of LACRALO who are either Jamaica or many of the islands in the Caribbean. So please, put your name up for the fellowship, and you'd be more than welcome to participate with our GA as an observer. And I think that's basically it [for us]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two clarifications. Number one, it is Glen with one N, Glen De Saint Gery, and parts of the Caribbean are served by ARIN.

Next item is an item for decision, something we rarely do at ALAC meetings these days. There is a document that is pointed to by item number seven, the scope of the ATRT 3. You may recall from previous discussions that there is significant overlap in the scope of the ATRT review and what is being done in the CCW Review Team, CCWG Accountability Group.

In fact, several of the items from ATRT 2 have been postponed and were assigned to CCWG groups in Work Stream 2. There was some concern that the next ATRT has to start this coming year – well, actually, it could be deferred by a year, but it has to start relatively soon and there would be significant overlap.

The recommendation has been made by the CCWG, initially to the Board. The Board said, "We don't have jurisdiction," and it is now a recommendation that has gone to the Chairs of the ACs and SO – and I'm on behalf of the ALAC bringing it to this group – to reduce the scope of the ATRT 3, similarly to what was recommended for the WHOIS RDS

Review Team, specifically to limit the scope to a review of how well ATRT 2 recommendations have been implemented.

Again, with a request that staff do the initial triage, initial report, and that a smaller review team be convened, specifically a review team that has experience and closely tracked ATRT 2. So essentially, this would be a short operation and will be limited to a review of whether ATRRT 2 was properly implemented, not a complete review of new items.

Now, I bring this to you with some trepidation, because as an ATRT 2 member, I'm one of the moderately few people – like Olivier – who has a lot of knowledge and experience within At-Large of ATRT 2. There are a few others, but not many.

So from that perspective, I'm not sure I'd like to support it, but I think it makes complete sense at this point. ICANN has spent a huge amount of time in the last two years introspection and looking at reorganizing itself.

To do a full ATRT 2 in parallel with the work that's going on, and then a new implementation over the next five years I think is carrying the introspection to a level which is beyond what we need right now. So, I would like to open it up for discussion, and hopefully a decision on whether the ALAC supports the reduced scope or not. I see Glenn has his hand up.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Alan, can I please be put in the queue?

ALAN GREENBERG: You can. Glenn, is that an old hand, or do you wish to speak? Not hearing Glenn, I'll give it to León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. Just to say that I support the suggestion that the CCWG has made. I am not wearing my [hat of] co-Chair but as an ALAC member, and I would of course encourage others to support the suggested approach by the CCWG. That's it, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, León. Given that the request came from the three co-Chairs, it would be an interesting position if you decided to object to it. But we will not comment further than that. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I just want to remind you that we are asking the Board to consider initiating a periodic review of the multi-stakeholder model to evaluate the overall composition and balance and so on and so forth.

                        We had written that in the ATLAS II report, and I was thinking that it could have been a good topic for ATRT 3, and to launch something to take care of that. But if we don't do that for ATRT 3, it will be in five years, and I have concern about that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien, did you raise that question when this was discussed in the CCWG Plenary? I don't recall, but I may have missed the meeting.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, because we get the discussion on ALAC, and I didn't raise it during the meeting of the CCWG at that time. It was something that came to my understanding after when we discussed about ATLAS II. As you'll remember, I was a Board member at that time, and I was not participating in too much detail about ATLAS II recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I understand. I'm just wondering. At this point to introduce a brand new idea when this letter is out to all seven Chairs is going to be somewhat difficult to go back and say, "Hold on, we should be doing something else completely."

                         I understand what you're saying, but I'm just not quite sure of the mechanism for it. Let's return to that in a moment. Let's hear the speakers first. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I'm somehow of the same view as Sébastien and think that this could be a missed opportunity to look at the balance of stakeholder engagement in ICANN. The other point I wanted to make is if we do proceed forward and say, "Yes, fine, let's just restrict ATRT 3 to this," it should be worded in a way that future accountability and transparency reviews will not all be the reduced ones.

Of course, the ATRT 4 will probably be looking at whatever ATRT 2 still hasn't done, and whatever recommendations ATRT 3 had made based on ATRT 2 recommendations not be done. Perhaps even ATRT 1 recommendations. I haven't quite kept track on whether all of the first ATRT recommendations have been implemented.

But it needs to be a one off, because here we are replacing a review process, an actual ICANN-wide review process with the work of a Cross-Community Working Group, and I think it might have some incidences on the balance of stakeholder involvement, if you have Cross-Community Working Groups versus Review Teams.

Review Teams are limited in the number of people who are on them, whilst working groups can be overflooded by one specific type of stakeholder that has more time than others. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. Just to be clear, in my mind, it is implicit that this is a one-off. Of course, one can make decisions five years from now, and one can't stop those decisions from being made, but there's no intent to not do ATRTs again. They're in the Bylaws as such, so subject to any discussion we make in the future.

We can certainly note it, but I see no problem with that. Is there a general feeling that we want to make a comment regarding the stakeholder balance? We have a show of hands. Now, as said, at this point, going back and essentially trying to get the other six ACs and SOs to rethink what ATRT 3 should be I think is going to be a bit late.

EN

But certainly, I have no problem going on record. I personally think that's not an ATRT issue, but something that needs to be chartered at the Board level. That's a personal opinion. Anyone? I see no ticks, no hands. Cheryl noted that she supported the reduction, noting she is also at risk. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. If it's to go with this situation, I suggest that we propose that the next ATRT, the ATRT 4 don't wait five years, but maybe this time to go back to the previous, to the three years, as it will be a light one, this one, it may be worthwhile not to wait five years.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a nice suggestion, I like that. General agreement on that, or does anyone disagree?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Alan, I would –

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: Somebody is saying agree. León is trying to say something.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: That was Andrei.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Andrei.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Okay, so I was trying to say that while I agree with the suggestion, I would just be mindful if some suggestion like this one wouldn't impact any kind of Bylaw changes. I know that ATRTs are [embedded] into the Bylaws and they have of course some periodic reviews in there.

So while I agree and I support the suggestion, let's just have a look at whether this would mean we would need to change the Bylaws, or if it would stand alone by itself.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection – but we will check – is it's no more than five years from the start of one to the start of another. May I ask staff to draft something for my review statement that I can make in response to this letter?

I think the substance is we agree with the reduction, we are concerned that an overall review of stakeholder balance which could have been done in ATRT will definitely not be done, and it should be considered in some other form, and this is a one-off and we should consider doing the next ATRT 4 in less than five years. Thank you.

I think we have now taken a decision. Item number eight, ICANN transition and accountability. León said he would like a couple of

minutes to review this current status and timeline. You have five minutes. Go ahead, León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan, and I will take less than five minutes. We have had some good progress on the human rights track, on the transparency, and we are starting to receive the replies for the SO and AC accountability questions that were sent to the different chartering organizations.

I believe that we are a little bit… We need to keep the pace with the rest of the SOs and ACs, so we do need to go [inaudible] of answering the questions, and I would definitely encourage everyone to take a look at them and to help Alan who is the penholder on this to reply to the CCWG on these questions.

We also have some travel support guidelines for our ICANN 58 meeting, and if anyone has [inaudible] support entitled for additional travel support by these guidelines, if you haven't filled your application, please do so at your earliest convenience as we are very short on time and we do need to have this finalized next week.

We have received a number of applications already, and we have approved basically all of them, but as I said, if there's anyone who has not filed his or her application for travel support, this is the time to do it, please. That's pretty much it, Alan. Thank you.

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

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, this is Seun. [inaudible] queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. First, we have Sébastien, Judith and then Seun. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Thank you, León, for your feedback. I just want to add two items, one who could be of interest for other people. The group about diversity is working hard, and I think the input of At-Large people will be very useful and welcome.

And the second point is about the group I am rapporteur of, about Ombudsman, is that we are embarking on the specific review of the ICANN Ombuds Office, and we are currently trying to finalize a request for proposal before this review. It's just an update of where we are on that, in addition to the update given by León. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. So, León, are you talking about the regular travel support, or is this something different? I'm a little confused. It did take a long time to get reimbursed this time, because I only just got mine like yesterday, but I was just wondering, is there also a different change in the per diem?

Was it not $60 a day? Was it more than that? I'm a little confused on what you were saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll take that. León was talking about the extra day of hotel and per diem if you are a formal member of the CCWG Accountability, or if you're one of the rapporteurs of the subteams. That is all that León was talking about.

The per diem changes every meeting, depending on the details of the meeting. It's documented in the documents that are sent out. There's a pointer to it with the invitation. And in general, there should be no reimbursements unless there are some unusual circumstances.

Most things are either covered by per diem or are paid for by ICANN. So, if you have a particular issue, then talk to me or staff about it and we'll look into it.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, Alan, I'm talking about if you had approval to book your own travel as opposed to having ICANN book your own travel. I had just gotten mine yesterday. It had been in the queue for over a month. It was supposed to be done before the meeting but it didn't get done, so it just got lost in the queue and it finally came out yesterday.

ALAN GREENBERG: ICANN is notoriously bad on the reimbursements, but as I said, talk to me or Heidi about it separately and we will try to make sure that if there's a problem, it gets rectified.

Any other comments on CCWG? The title still says IANA transition. I don't think there's anything to talk about.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, Seun, I'm sorry. I was just looking at hands. Go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI.   Okay, yes. I think [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI.   Can you hear me? Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can hear you. We heard about three words and then you disappeared.

SEUN OJEDEJI.   Okay. Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

SEUN OJEDEJI.   I just wanted to confirm from León, what are the scope has been expanded for members and rapporteurs? But I think Alan has answered that part, so that's fine for me. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Javier says in the thing he has not gotten his reimbursement for per diem. Per diems aren't reimbursement. They should have been paid in advance. Occasionally, they are not paid until just after. If you haven't gotten them at all, they probably forgot about you. Talk to Heidi or me, and we'll make sure that constituency travel remembers.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Well, Heidi, how are you doing?

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, do you want to answer that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Javier, I was actually just private chatting you. I will be in touch with you in one moment.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Well, that's great. It's Andrei, I'm just asking how you're doing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, Andrei, hi. Sorry, still getting to know your voices. I should know those accents better than that.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's no missing a Russian accent.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Oh, yes. This right here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, enough frivolity. Is there anyone else who has anything on item number eight?

Item number nine, At-Large review, updates and next steps.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Oh my God.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly and Cheryl, I have allocated 15 minutes because I suspect there might be some interesting discussion on this topic. But if Holly or Cheryl

would like to give the summary of where we are before we open it up to any other comments.

HOLLY RAICHE: Hi. I have to say, I think the water that Andrei is drinking is just slightly spiked. So, where are we up to? We are very close – we being the working party – we'll be having another call tomorrow, so that will be the second call. The timeline of where we're up to, there's the working party second teleconference tomorrow, and the deadline for comments from the working party and ALAC is 22 December at 23:59.

The draft report should be going out for public comment on the 6th of January, with the public comment basically throughout January. The final report for our discussion with the working party is 15 March. After that, the final report will be posted and the Board will have the presentation of their final report in June.

On participation, just to repeat what [have been] said before, it is the working party that actually has the direct link to provide comments onto the document itself. That said, what we have said is if people in the At-Large community want to comment, they're welcome to do so through a working party member.

The results so far, we have had seven out of the 22-member working party commenting, and I'm hoping that other members of the working party will comment. We've had two sets of comments from people who are not members of the working party but have commented through members, and those comments have been passed on to the ITEMS team as well.

So, a total of about nine comments have been made, and we're hoping for more. In terms of themes, there are a number of themes that have come out of the comments. Basically, what is it that the At-Large community represents?

Do we represent end users? How do we do that? Or do we represent their interest? There's some discussion on that. There are various comments on how people get involved and the difficulty of that. Some of those raise issues about volunteer time, about the actual technology, the difficulty for many people in simply getting access, and the difficulty simply in understanding the issues themselves.

There is a little bit of discussion about liaisons. There have been some comments about the involvement of [inaudible] ISOC chapters. Obviously, a lot of discussion about the meetings, about what is being proposed for meetings, and in terms of ATLAS regional meetings.

[Aligned] to that, obviously members and how people can get involved in terms of At-Large structures and individual membership, and tied up with that issue is obviously things like voting rights [inaudible] individual membership.

Those are the issues, and what we are hoping for is not only people's comments on what's been said – and by the way, ITEMS definitely wants to hear if there are factual errors, please let them know, as well as suggestions. Because from the very head of the Structural Improvement Committee, who's [inaudible] one of her comments at the very end of the last meeting was, "What we want is to tie the sorts of

comments that have been made to recommendations, so that there are many ways forward for improvement of ALAC."

In summary, any questions? And Maureen asks, "Are you asking members who commented only to find their comments disappear?" No, Maureen, you're not there, and you did exactly what I did. So a reminder, when you use your link and comment [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, this is Seun, I'd like to stay in the queue.

HOLLY RAICHE: When you write the comment, hit the comment button. Otherwise, it disappears and you scream and then go to drink, as I did. In terms of Dev, "How are the comments being received by the At-Large?" They're simply welcoming all comments. And Dev, if you want to send me a separate e-mail, if you want to e-mail ITEMS directly, whatever, your comments will be passed on, which is what I've been doing.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'd like to stay in the queue, please.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sorry, Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, yes, thank you. I sent in some comments, some questions through one of the working party members. Because some of them I'd like to get responses to that before the new draft comes up, may I know if those have been responded to by ITEMS?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you could tell us who you sent them to, we'll make sure that they submitted them. There have been no responses at this point.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, Seun. Nobody has been responded to. They're not being individually responded to. If you'd like, I will have a look at what has been said, because I've seen what you've said and what's been passed on, and in the course of discussion, if the answers are there, yes.

But ITEMS have not been responding to – [the points] that they're doing now is simply collecting feedback. They're not responding at this stage. Okay? It's not individual.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, alright.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but Seun, let someone know privately or publicly – as you wish – who you sent them to so we can make sure that they have been submitted.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, I have seen them, and they have been submitted. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, fine. Sébastien, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It was me, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan and Holly. I wanted to have a question about the process, because if I heard well, you – we send – anybody outside the working group sends somebody within the working group, they send to the Chair of the working group and you send it directly to ITEMS. Is that the process?

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible] already happened.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, and I just want to tell you that you may have to tell that, because I am not very happy that it goes through the [hand] of ITEMS like that. I was thinking that you were gathering the inputs from anybody from the working group, and you will send consolidated remarks or questions to ITEMS.

And I am really annoyed that you send my file directly, because I could have done that myself. But you request that it goes through you, through the group, and I understood that. But then if it goes through you, then it's because you will be doing some adding value to that. And the way I have written the thing, it was for you, not for them, and I am concerned. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, I'm sorry to hear that. You made a number of comments, some of which, yes, were just comments on topics. Some of it which raised issues for them. I have just summarized in a way that I will summarize for the working party tomorrow as to the general tenor of what's been said.

If people do not wish for me to pass on their comments directly, I'm happy to do that as well. And if you make comments, please indicate to me that you do not wish me to pass them on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or you could pass them on anonymously.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, I think Sébastien's problem is not that they were passed on anonymously, but they were passed on at all. So, if you're going to pass comments on, please tell me if you wish me to pass them on or not, and how.

ALAN GREENBERG: In some ideal world, it could have happened that the working party would review all comments and put in a consolidated comment of the working party. The timeline and the volume of comments did not allow that in this case, so I think we're playing it by ear. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just briefly and specifically to Sébastien's concern – and yes, Alan, it's very much a matter of a compressed timeline now. There was only ever going to be a very small amount of time for this interaction, which under the contract is an interaction between ITEMS and the working party, which is why we offered to the now curious and engaged community – inclusive of the ALAC – that wanted to put input in this early stage that they could put it through our committee.

Holly's decision to put things straight through is absolutely fine. Sorry if it wasn't clear, but in fact, the only people ITEMS taking things from and interacting with at the moment is in fact the working party. So, that's just kind of what we're all stuck with having to do.

Obviously, after our meeting tomorrow – or at our meeting tomorrow – we'll make it very clear to ITEMS that some of the material put through may be in a format that was intended to be further edited, but I think that's the best we can do. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll go on record as saying ITEMS, the plan that they agreed to, the contract they agreed to says they will have a revision out on the 6th of January. I have said that based on the volume of comments, if

they need more time, they should take it, schedule be damned. It does not look like that advice is being followed, so the timeline will be obeyed as far as we can tell at this point.

To answer the questions in the chat in reverse order, to Carlton – who I think was also already answered, but nevertheless – the working party is a creature of the ALAC. It was created by the ALAC. It has representatives outside of the ALAC, but it was created by the ALAC.

And to Maureen, if you made comments on the document and you did not click comment on each of the comments, they were lost. If you want the comments to be honored, you have to type them in again. And yes, you are allowed to be frustrated and have it show in this set of comments.

I was reminded of a document I commented on, where when I did it again because I had forgotten to hit comment on every one of the 40 or 50 comments I made. I had a lot of exclamation marks after my statement of frustration. Anything else?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, could I [inaudible] Carlton –

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Just Carlton has made some comments in the chat. Carlton, could you e-mail those to me, and I will pass them on? Or e-mail them directly to the ITEMS team. And anybody else who wants to comment, if you don't want me to pass them on verbatim, I won't. If you want me to pass them on verbatim, I will. Just let me know.

But please, the final deadline for commenting is the 22nd of December, at 23:59, and however you want me to pass the comments on, I will. But again, to repeat Cheryl's point, way back when the working party was formed – which is a long time ago now, practically a year – it is the working party – and this is the process that was agreed all the way up to the Board – the working party is actually the group that participates in development of the document.

Remember, there is public comment. In the public comment, obviously, ALAC and the At-Large community will have the opportunity to comment, and I suggest that anybody who is interested in the issues, if you're not a member of the working party, please participate in the drafting of the official ALAC response to the review, because that's going to be critical. And with that, I've finished.

Sébastien has his hand up. Sébastien, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. I'd like to stand in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you, Seun. Go ahead. We're running out of time at this point, so I ask people to be brief. Go ahead, Sébastien.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sébastien and Seun.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you. Yes, I think I understand the process was supposed to be done. I just want to remind you that this working group was set up to ALAC team before today. That means that we have had [to] change. It was not one year ago, it was earlier, because it was before I joined ALAC.

And that's part, I guess, of the overall issue. But nevertheless, it's a working group, and I think that Seun put a good question. Regarding the current situation where it was [sent] and comment outside, it was comment on Facebook and other social media, I think it could be better if we can have time to comment it as ALAC.

Because if we wait for the public comments, we are already [almost sure] that we will be in trouble, because people will say, "Okay, they changed the report because you asked for." And I don't want to be in a situation to do that again during the public comment.

I prefer to begin once, not twice. I would like to suggest that we take I don't know how much time, but to have a specific presentation and timing for ALAC members and regional leaders to comment on the report before going to the public comment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: To comment on the report and presumably an opportunity for the report to be revised. Sébastien? Have we lost Sébastien? Have we lost Sébastien? He said yes. Okay, thank you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, it's because I was muted. But yes, I agree with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I saw your tick mark now. Thank you. I personally agree with you. Neither the reviewers nor the staff people responsible for the review seem to be inclined to do that. Clearly, that would be an extra step associated for items, and one that is not budgeted at this point. However, I will pass that message on tomorrow, with no expectation anyone is going to listen, to be quite honest.

We have Seun, and then Olivier.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. Just two comments. The first one, Holly said we pass comments through the working party, then you said we can also send it directly to ITEMS. I think those are two very significant difference. So, [inaudible] directly to ITEMS? I think it should be clear who we're passing it through?

My second comment is in relation to what I suggested on the list, about having the opportunity to look at this draft at ALAC. I don't think it will help us as the leadership of ALAC, or At-Large [inaudible] opposing a report during the public comment.

It will not be good in our own interest. It will not help the organization. That's why I prefer that we – even if it is two days, 48 hours or [inaudible] we have before it goes for public comment, it would be good that we put in our views, and then [inaudible] they can review it before it goes to public comment.

I personally may have to withdraw some of my comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sorry, Alan, please, let me express myself here. I personally may have to withdraw some of my comments from the public, because I feel that they are probably going to be inappropriate at that time, but I would be more comfortable saying them even before it goes to public comment. So, if you'd like it to be the public comment, then fine. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Seun. In short, you're supporting what Sébastien asked for. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I support what both other persons have mentioned just now. I was going to ask if this was an exact science. In other words, when the GNSO went through its second review process – and I'm only doing this from memory and I'd like if it could be checked – the council

did not have first right of view, so the whole GNSO council, and they gave back some feedback before a version was put out for public comment.

I recall that there was quite some time between the first draft of the review organization and the public comment. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I have Cheryl in the queue. I'll note the action item that was recorded was not what was suggested. What was suggested might involve a webinar or a presentation, but specifically was to allow an opportunity for the ALAC to comment prior, and the report to be revised prior to the public comment process. That might involve a webinar, but the webinar is not the substance of it. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Olivier, as far as I can ascertain and remember, in fact the process we are going through and the contracted sets that ITEMS is to be engaged with in our system is only very minorly modified from the process in the GNSO.

In fact, they quoted the perfection of the GNSO model to us so many times that in one of our preparatory meetings in the working group, I banned the staff from using the term GNSO, or I was going to scream. It was practically every sentence said, "And in the GNSO, and in the GNSO review..."

So, our process is very closely modeled – if not absolutely modeled – on what happened in the second GNSO review. To your point – and I was trying to type into the chat and wrangle a granddaughter at the same time, so I'll say it while I've got the microphone – to Seun's point, one thing we can do in our meeting with ITEMS from the leadership team tomorrow is see if we can arrange what has been done so there is precedence in a public comment before, and that's for the public comment on ATRT 1, and I think also ATRT 2 publications is that we also have the ability for anonymized information to go through.

In other words, ITEMS who will be the recipients of the public comment material so that they can eventually create a final review by later in the calendar 2017 year, that we do have an option for people such as you, Seun, who prefer not to have their comments scrutinized by the community but that can go directly to ITEMS and then that material – should it be deemed useful and should it have influence, and that's not up to us, that's up to them – can be used in an anonymized fashion. We can certainly try and do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point out that will allow all the anonymous GNSO people to reiterate their positions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, exactly, and I would –

ALAN GREENBERG: Folks, we're really late at this point. Is there anything else that needs to be added? I'll give the closing words to Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. We will raise the issue tomorrow that has been raised by Sébastien and Seun, and in terms of – I'd just like to repeat, Cheryl's absolutely right. And I sat around and listened to them, kept getting confused about GNSO and ALAC reviews. This process is so close to what the GNSO review is.

                          I don't want to pore through those documents, but I do remember this is practically a copy, and the process itself is the subject of contract between ITEMS and the Board. They are being as flexible as they can. We will see if that extends to the sorts of suggestions that have been made, and we will talk about that tomorrow. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: But of course, the GNSO report was a milk toast report which said, "Make some minor changes, but everything is going just perfectly." Not clear if this process works for us.

                          Next item, BCEC and BMSPC updates and next steps. Tijani and Julie, who would like to go first? Cheryl, was that a new hand that you wanted to speak again

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I'm trying to get it down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And I note Tijani supported the request for an extra ALAC comment period before the public one. Go ahead, whoever is speaking.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I support that Julie starts.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Tijani. Very briefly, as you should all be aware, the BCEC announced its slate of candidates on the 16th of December, which was a few days early. We announced that we had selected two candidates: Alan Greenberg and León Sanchez. They may be known to some of you.

And basically, we've I guess completed the evaluation stage of our process. What we're now going to do – having handed over to the BMSPC to manage the remainder of the process – is we're going to look back over our own process from start to finish, and look carefully at what was done and what might be able to be improved in the future.

So, our work isn't completed yet, but we are going to take the festive season off and we're going to get back into it in the new year and do some work on documenting what happened and what we would recommend for the future. Thanks very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Julie. A comment – or I'm not sure if it's a comment or a question – before Tijani comes up. We've never had a partition process that succeeded, but I always presumed it was the BCEC who accepted those names and integrated them into the slate.

The rules of procedure are actually silent on that, so when Tijani speaks, I just want conformation that he's happy that it's a BMSPC issue, just to make sure it doesn't fall between the cracks. Go ahead, Tijani.

JULIE HAMMER: Can I just comment –

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sure, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Before hopping over to Tijani, it actually does say on the timelines that it is the BCEC who does the addition of the name to the slate. It's certainly not the BCEC that manages the consultation process, and one of the things that I'm going to suggest to my committee that this should be a BMSPC role explicitly, because it really isn't an evaluation.

We've done the evaluation. This is a process that enables our evaluation to be added to, so to me, it's more part of the process than part of the evaluation. But at the moment, it is on the timeline, it's specified as the BCEC that adds any petition names to the slate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Julie. Of course, the timeline is just a part of the process, not locked in stone. I suspect the origin is it was not clear when we first wrote the rules that the list of – the candidates who didn't make the slate was published, in which case it would have to go to the BCEC to verify that they had submitted an expression of interest.

That might be the origin. It's not particularly important, as long as it doesn't fall between the cracks now. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan and Julie. Now that the BCEC has already published the slate, we meet the team, made a call, and the BMSPC [inaudible] I think. [inaudible] for the RALOs. Not a call, a reminder for the RALOs that they have the opportunity to add candidates from those who already submitted EoIs to BCEC, and we'll remind them of all the rules of the modalities, how to do, etc.

And also, we mentioned that we'll make a call among the RALOs to consulate and perhaps to see what is better to do to work together. So, everything was done in a long mail to all the RALOs, [which is] public for everyone, and once the RALO [inaudible] one RALO may make a decision and at least two other RALOs support it, [inaudible] so that's done.

Normally, as per the timeline, normally the BCEC is the one who is in charge of the slate. So, any addition after we do all the work, and then they add names to the slate, and then they submit the final slate that you will use for the election afterwards. So,   this   [the   situation]

[inaudible] if there is a question [that needs to be] answered. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any questions? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we will go on to the next agenda item. Thank you for being brief. The next item is the 2016 IGF with updates and key takeaways. Let's see, where are we at this point? We are just about out of time.

I'm going to defer this item, and we can ask people to submit things electronically or defer to the next meeting, and we'll come back to it if there's enough time at the end of the meeting. I hope that is agreeable to people.

Next item is the ALAC objection process to the new gTLD process. This is something that's come up in the new gTLD PDP that's going on right now. It is not an issue that was raised during the initial triage of issues, but I think it's something I brought up and I think needs to be addressed.

For those of you who may or may not remember, the ALAC was given funding in the last gTLD process to file objections. We did file several community objections. They did not succeed, and they did not succeed for a number of reasons, largely because they were community objections and the person reviewing it did not feel that we had met the threshold for defining the community.

There was also some question about whether – and the two are linked, unfortunately – whether we really had standing to talk on behalf of the

community, if we had defined the community properly. Unlike the independent objector who de facto had standing, there were no comments in the applicant guidebook on whether we – on what grounds we could successfully file an objection.

We chose to file objections in a certain way, they did not succeed. The question is, are we interested in maintaining this capability in the following round? I think what we need to do is look at the process we went through last time, the objections we filed and the adjudge and the judgment on them.

I think this needs to be done by people who are experienced in that area of law and give a summary to ALAC so that we can reasonably make a decision whether we simply withdraw from the process and don't have the ability to have objections paid for, which means we don't file objections. Or we decide we leave the process as is, which is the default, or we feel we need additional words to make sure that if we file objections, they can be fairly looked at.

What I would suggest to do is put together a small group of people. I would like Olivier to participate – but certainly not lead it, because he was a key person in the last process – and find within our group a couple of – and I always am chilled when I say this – but a couple of lawyers who have experience in this area to look at this.

So, all I'm asking for agreement of the ALAC to proceed like this, and then we will try to find some people to take on the task. It's going to have to be done moderately quickly, but I don't think it's a very big task. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd like to support that. I think that there are some ridiculous issues that happened, and I think it's because in fact our objections were not listened to some of the problems that have since occurred occurred. I'd be happy to be part of that small group, because I think that I agree with you. It was very frustrating to be told that we couldn't object.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, to be candid, my recollection was they were refused because we were deemed not to have standing. I have re-read the report, and that is not what it said. The report was largely rejected because we chose to file a community objection, and the standards of how you define a community are rather difficult and they did not feel we met the mark on that.

it's not clear why we filed a community objection as opposed to a public interest objection, so I think we need to look at both the history and the documents, and go forward. I don't think we need a lot of discussion, unless there's anyone here who believes we should not do this. If there's anyone here who would like to be involved in the process, talk to me privately, please.

I think we want to keep a really lean and mean group.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Olivier.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: No, this is León.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, León. Go ahead, león.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes, just to say that count me in with the team of lawyers who participate in this effort.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, are you a lawyer? I didn't know that.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I happen to be one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I'm the kind of lawyer that is [inaudible] representative.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, León. Anyone else, any further comment on this? Otherwise, I'll take it away as the task assigned to me, if we could have an action item please. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I will be a bit [inaudible] but I wanted to ask one question: do we have somewhere specific discussion about supporting application –

ALAN GREENBERG: There is nothing in the process which gives us a specific right to support applications. I don't think there's anything in the whole process about supporting applications. I think there's only an objection process.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, I lost my voice.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, Alberto, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] unmute.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Sébastien is finished, for the moment anyway. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: As you can see, I typed something on the chat. Alan, I can be part of that team, if you will. First of all, I would like to get some information. I will do my research just to see what the requirements are for this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry, the connection is lost.

ALBERTO SOTO: I know there might be certain requirements for that, so I would like to be part of that team. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, noted. Anyone else would please contact me privately? Anyone else? Comments on this? No? Let's go on to the next issue then.

The next item on the agenda is the Finance and Budget Subcommittee membership and fiscal year 18 budget request. I'll turn it over to Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much, Alan. So, on the first part, the FBSC members, the call went out last week. The deadline is today for the members, these are voting members. All RALOs except EURALO have identified their ALAC and RALO members, and EURALO is actively looking. The call for non-voting participants will go out today for all of the RALOs. So, that's where we are with that.

On the fiscal year 18 additional budget request, we've put together a workspace for this that includes information on the ICANN finance criteria, the timeline, the At-Large additional criteria and timeline.

The key dates for this process are really – the key one is really the January 30th. That's the deadline for the submission of these additional budget requests. But before that, we need to first ask the RALOs to develop – or people within the RALOs to develop – their proposal, and then go through their RALOs and get approval from the RALOs, and then send that through to the FBSC. Then, the FBSC will take a look at them a couple of times, and then they will select the ones that go through to the ICANN control [inaudible].

Then in May, during the main Board session, the Board will approve the request that will be approved officially. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Heidi, and all of your echoes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I heard those.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we please find the line? Oh, we have found it. Thank you. Any questions, comments? I'll note that Heidi did say we're on a tight timeline, and RALOs and ALAC members should start thinking of and perhaps starting to draft requests that will be going through. We will have a busy time in January doing this.

Seeing no comments, seeing no hands, we will go on to the next item, At-Large at ICANN 58. Gisella is not with us today, and I presume Heidi will take the lead on this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, thanks for that. I'm going to just quickly go through some of the items. A lot of these are really for you. So, first on the agenda under this topic there's a blank schedule. I've sent that to the ALT to take a look at, and that is still being developed. That hopefully should be published very shortly, if it isn't already. Perhaps Ariel or Yesim could take a look if it's on the meeting page for ICANN 58.

Suggestions for the HIT – that's the high interest topics – the deadline is this next Friday coming up, 23rd, so please, it's up to ALAC and At-Large to come up with any. I know that one was the public interest. A working group worked with [inaudible] to submit one. That was a big success, so please do work on that.

Then, something that we'd really like to get your input sooner than later is the key ALAC issue that you wish to be discussing during that face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen, and then also which AC/SO SGs – Advisory Committees, Supporting Organizations and Stakeholder Groups – and senior staff that you may wish to meet with, please do.

If we could identify those earlier, that would help us in making sure that they can schedule at a convenient time.

ALAN GREENBERG:	On that one, we will be doing a survey, similar but not identical to what we did last time. We'll do that early in January.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Okay, that's good to know. Okay, I don't see Dev on this call for outreach and engagement, but Glenn, I know that you chaired the last Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement. Do you wish to just give a very brief update on that?
GLENN MCKNIGHT:	Sure. Yes, we talked a lot about the outreach efforts, particularly homage to the NCUC people at the IGF Mexico. So Adam and [inaudible] on our call as well as Jean-Jacques. The Outreach and Engagement Committee, it's preliminary for us to talk about what we'll actually do.

I did ask Olivier, Wolf and [inaudible] what plans EURALO is having in terms of outreach, [community] and what activities. None of them had any reports at this point, Heidi. |
| HEIDI ULLRICH: | Okay. It might be that Olivier has some items now, because they've just come off their monthly EURALO call, and there were a lot of discussions planned on that. Olivier? |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Coming off mute takes a longer time than I wanted to. Yes, Glenn, I'm just about to write to the co-Chairs of the Outreach and Engagement |

Working Group, the Chair of the Capacity Building Working Group, and a few other people as well to let you know about the EURALO plans to work together to come up with a good engagement of new people in the forthcoming Copenhagen meeting. So, it's going to be in your mailbox in about five-ten minutes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you, Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Someone is typing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. So, coming back to the items, now we're on to the social events. I believe that there will be some sort of EURALO showcase during the Copenhagen meeting, and I'm aware that – just looking at Gisella's notes here, excuse me.

I've also now heard that the AC/SO SG RALO leaders' dinner will be planned on Sunday, the 12th of March. So please, those who are in that group, if you could put your calendar, just pencil that in and you'll get a formal invitation shortly for that, and also that the travelers for the CCWG, the approved travelers have been notified, I believe, or announced as well, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: They haven't been announced, but I did hear a statement saying they were all approved.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, they were all approved. That means that there might be some [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: We heard that from León a few minutes ago. That's the first I've heard.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And for logistics, just on the travel issues, I'm aware from constituency travel that they will start trying to book in January. Just a little heads up for those who believe they will be participating in the leadership program, please do not book yet, because you obviously need to be there a little bit earlier, and the deadline for both of the academy ones – well, the CSP, the Chairing Skills Program is today, and there's a little bit of flexibility for the leadership program, but then Sandra and her team will be making the decision early in January.

                         So, if you have registered for the leadership program, please don't book your itinerary until you've heard. And I think that's it, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. One item is a social event for At-Large leadership, and we are talking about a dinner on the Thursday – I think it is a

Thursday night, but the last formal night of the meetings. Presumably, there will be a reception, an ICANN-wide cocktail.

I have asked to try to find out whether there's going to be substantive food at that, or the normal meager pickings, and presumably it is the latter. Then, I'm suggesting a meal. Clearly, some people might be leaving before that, but I'm guessing most people will be around for that, and we will probably be organizing.

If anyone thinks that's a really bad idea, then they should speak up and we'll look at what other options we have, but it's not clear that we have a lot of other days that we will be able to do that with. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. What about the extra day that I said that I cannot find a flight that leaves in the evening? [inaudible] Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Tijani, you're talking about the ALT. Is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. What about – go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm in the process of finalizing that and making the request.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. For the record, when Bernie asked to complete the template for the travel support for the CCWG, I saved the template with the whole period, including the CCWG meeting and also the ALT meeting, and I warned him about that. I don't know if it is correct or not, but I did that in this way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It doesn't really matter, because just because you're right it doesn't mean they give you the day. But I will be working on that in the next day or two. For those ALT members who have not said whether they need an extra day travel or not, please respond. But that's not an ALAC issue.

Anything else? Judith asked, "Is there a gala?" I have no clue.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, yes, there is.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is a gala.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything further on the meeting? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we can go on to Any Other Business. The first one is Sébastien on mail and domain name transfer. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Alan. Just very briefly, I tried to change one of my domain names from one registrar to another one, and it happened that the mail address was from my previous previous previous job, and now to change the mail address you need to have the agreement of the previous mail address and the new one, and it's becoming quite an [inaudible]

                      I was thinking that maybe we can set up some good practice for end users about how to move one domain name from a registrar to another registrar, and also, I got trouble to move my mail system from one provider to another. And I think it could be useful not just for me, but for a lot of end users to try to explain that.

                      And I wrote something on the website, different pieces, and I suggest that At-Large handles that. It's not [inaudible] but to provide services to end users would be a good thing, I suggest. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two comments on that, and I see Holly has her hand up. The number one comment is a somewhat cynical one. Of every time we have discussed ALAC taking responsibility for user-type documentation, nothing ever happens. We get no volunteers.

We have had staff write some documents over the last decade, but we have a number of times said ALAC should be concerned about users, and rarely do we actually have volunteers following through on that. So, that's just a comment that may or may not happen this time.

Secondly, there is supposed to be a fair amount of documentation on the ICANN website aimed at registrants with just those kind of issues. Have you looked for it? Have you tried to see if there is anything that would be helpful there already?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will go to check again, but I didn't find. But maybe I will try again, even though it's not easy to navigate the website.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just because it's there doesn't mean you can find it, and I may be wrong about it being there. But my recollection is those are the kind of issues that a significant amount of work was done on, frequently asked questions and how to do things that are common. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, just a comment on the issue. As you would know, it's IRTP A, B, C, D, and for those of us who sat on them, there was a lot of discussion, and I was part of that discussion, I have to say. Some of the restrictions on transfer, and difficulties you may perceive as transfer, and the need to identify yourself is to protect a lot of users from actually being transferred without their knowledge.

So, we tried to strike a balance between making a transfer easy, but protecting end users from being transferred without their knowledge. So, there is a balance that's been struck. It may not be the right balance, but that's why it's not necessarily easy.

And yes, Alan, I would support you, there is information on the website. Again, I don't know how easy it is to find, but believe me, there have been a lot of [inaudible] and meetings on this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you, Holly. There is no question that it's a difficult issue. There is an ICANN policy which requires you to confirm annually that you are who you say you are, and Sébastien, if you have had a five-year-old or ten-year-old or whatever address, it would be interesting to know what the registrar has been doing when they have not gotten confirmation every year, or perhaps someone at your old organization has been responding to those e-mails.

I don't know which, but it's something that one might want to look at. It certainly is a difficult problem, because hijackings are a real, major issue, and at the same time, we know people let e-mail addresses go bad. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. If you go to the ICANN front page, under Get Started, underneath that you've got Beginner's Guide, and one of the guides in there is the Beginner's Guide to Domain Names. It was written in 2010, and it is available in English, Spanish, and French.

This would have all of the detail with regards to how you register, reregister, move domain names, etc. I don't think it's that much out of date, but certainly, yes, some of the work of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy part A, B, C, D, whatever the whole alphabet is concerned may have made some changes to that, and perhaps it would be time for us to request that an updated version of the Beginner's Goodie to Domain Names be drafted.

I understand this is a staff thing that staff members do on their spare time, so that would be really worthwhile for our users. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which section did you point to, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Which section? Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: You said on the main page, say those words again now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You go to the ICANN page, and it says, "Get started." Under Get Started, it says Beginner's Guide, Newcomer Program, Fellowship Program. So, you go to Beginner's Guide and you've got all this wonderful stuff, including IANA Functions, Participating in ICANN, Participating in At-Large, Guide to IP Addresses, Domain Names, etc.

ALAN GREENBERG: Beginner's Guide to Domain Names. Alright. I'm not sure those documents answer those questions, but there is also a section on Help that talks about registrar problems. I'm not sure this is a registrar problem. In any case, Sébastien, is that a new hand?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, please. Thank you, Alan. Yes, I got all those information, but the thing is that changed a few days or a few weeks ago, and then for users, we might definitely try to have an updated version of those Beginner's Guide, because the way it's handled now to change e-mail address is quite complicated and different.

And I understand that it was to protect, but when you protect too much, you get some trouble too. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's no question. My recollection however is what I was talking about should have been – would be under the compliance page, but it may or may not. Seun, go right ahead, and then Dev.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, so just a quick one. I think there are quite significant references to guides online in relation to this. [None of that's really] on ICANN website, so if there is a need to put the collection of those links or [inaudible] confine that information, maybe we'll compile it in a wiki somewhere.

We can do that, but I think I personally as a registrant would not necessarily want a domain to be transferred without an e-mail confirmation from me, so I think that is very important, to get [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: There's no question that it's a balance. Dev, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. It is buried under ICANN's website. You have to go to Resources, and once you go to Resources, on the left-hand side you have to go to Registrars. And underneath Registrars dropdown menu, then the domain name transfer. And under that, there is a sequence of several pages on this information, because the policy was updated on the 1ˢᵗ of December, 2016 with a new policy in place.

ALAN GREENBERG: And there are also extensive lists under contractual compliance.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: The fact that there are multiple lists on the same subject is interesting, of course. Sébastien, go right ahead. Let's go on to the next topic afterwards though.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. It will be very short. It's like when you sign an agreement when you have an update of your software. You read everything and you know everything. I really feel that for that, we need shorter term of reference, and for transferring domain names, maybe it's not the best way to get information to the ends user and we may try to find an easier way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no question. One of the problems is – and I'll be blunt about this – we have complained a lot about the quality of documentation. We have not followed through on promises to review it and comment. So, simply at a meeting saying it's not good enough, we really do have to take responsibility a little bit more and give more substantive comments when we find something is inadequate. Just saying.

Sébastien, your next item was auction proceeds, CCWG. Let me give you an update before you do that however. The call for members, I believe, has just gone out or is just about to go out. I've lost track, but there either has been or will be a call for members, which will be passed on to the ALAC, and we will have to do our own call for interested parties.

So, since I'm on the drafting team, I see early versions of it and I can't remember whether it has formally gone out or not. Heidi, do you know?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, I have not. I can look that up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. In any case, it either has just happened or will be happening very soon, but I'll turn it back over to you, Sébastien. Judith, is that on the last topic or the next topic?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It's on Any Other Business, which is I guess the last Any Other Business.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then we'll wait until we finish this one. Ariel, do you have a comment?

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Alan. Just regarding the call for membership for the CCWG has gone out.

ALAN GREENBERG: It has gone out.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, and I have posted an announcement in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't need to right now. We do need to do an internal call then, if you could put that in an action item for me and staff. Sébastien, over to

you. I'm not sure if that address is what you're raising, or if you have some other issue.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. It was just to tell you that GNSO has already named their members, and the call for applicants it's already – member of participants it's already open, and there are at least three people in this call who have already put their name, and I wanted to know how we will organize the selection of when select as a member of this by At-Large. Although, with an [inaudible] on that, I don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG: It will go to the selection committee, the ALAC Appointee Selection Committee, and I have no doubt in this case we will name five people, one per region. I can't imagine anything else happening.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Judith, you have another AOB. I'll note we have 12 minutes before the end of the hour.

SEUN OJEDEJI: And the Chair and a co-Chair.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Seun, do you have a question?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Judith. I heard Seun, we'll go to him afterwards.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I just wanted to make sure everyone knows that we're starting the captioning pilot again in January. We – as the e-mail went out, we have three sessions in January, three sessions in February, and that we can have one in Spanish and one in French in February.

So, just let me or the other people or staff know which sessions you want to be captioned, and we are open to new ones that haven't been chosen yet in the last pilot. We just want to make sure, because we plan on submitting another project for the next budget period, so we want to get this finished up beforehand. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Judith. I suggest you send an e-mail to the ALAC list, just to follow up with us.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I did, but staff can send another e-mail out to the list. Silvia has been sending e-mails.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Seun, did you want to get in?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, just to mention that I think apart from – hello, can you hear me? This is Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can hear you. Sorry, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, I just wanted to say, if I understand, initially it was said that there will be five members, then there will be one extra co-Chair. So, I just wanted to make sure that that is going to be six. Or, is the co-Chair going to be among the members?

ALAN GREENBERG: As far as I'm concerned, the co-Chair is referenced in a completely different part of the charter than the members are. We have the right to name a co-Chair in addition to the five members, and that is still my preference.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Otherwise, we disenfranchise one of the regions by having a member who effectively cannot participate, and I don't think that's a good idea.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, I prefer them and the Co-Chair as well, I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't have to have a co-Chair. That's not an obligation, but we can, should we choose. Alright. We have another nine minutes. Is there a strong desire to do the IGF item? In which case I will open the floor to anyone who's at the IGF to give any brief reports.

We're talking about León, me, Olivier, Maureen, Tijani, and probably other people who I now can't remember. Anybody? I see no volunteers. We have Tijani, and we have Dev.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we have Olivier. Alright, you now have no more than two minutes each.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. As for my participation, I had a lightning session about the unlawful use of the end user's data, and it was a new kind of session. In fact, my proposal was refused at the beginning before it was accepted, and then the secretary and [inaudible] saying that if I really want it, I can present it as a lightning session, and it was done like this.

It was the first experience, and I liked it. [inaudible] it is shorter, but it is more focused, and I [inaudible] the problem [inaudible] the place was very near to the restaurant, so the smell of the meal, etc., was really disturbing. But otherwise, I think it was very good.

I also chaired another workshop, about the use of [inaudible] Internet and education, and I was a speaker in another workshop about also capacity building, also all those initiatives of capacity building, how they must be done, are they better free or are they to be paid for, etc.? So, I was a speaker in this other Work Stream. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have three more speakers and six minutes left. Then we'll need 30 seconds to do the wrap-up. Dev, you're next.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. And I guess my comment is just going to focus a little bit more about the At-Large, what I've observed regarding At-Large outreach and our lack of outreach, I would say. Even though there were about 20 persons from At-Large at the IGF, I felt that in a way we didn't really maximize our potential to do outreach in a more structured way at the IGF.

So, discussion has been ongoing in the outreach and engagement subcommittee about doing a stronger proposal to do outreach at the next IGF. That's it.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I do note that I think the majority of people who were there from At-Large were self-funded. I'm not sure that those who are self-funded have an obligation to carry out At-Large's objectives. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And permit me to disagree with you on this. I think that anybody from any ALS, whether funded, self-funded, not funded or even not there should be an ambassador for the At-Large community. That's the only way this is going to work.

If they are not, and they say, "Well, I'm not funded so I'm not going to actually look out for other ALSes and do some pro bono stuff with At-Large during that one week," then their work during the 51 other weeks of the year basically goes to waste. And I think that's a pretty terrible way to look at things.

I was also disappointed that we didn't have a coordinated outreach strategy and going out to look out for people. I saw the NCUC doing an excellent job, and I congratulated them on this. The next IGF is going to take place in Geneva, just down the road from – well, sort of in the middle of Europe. I would suggest that we start work now, to coordinate our work to really make an impact in Geneva. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, I don't know if we can say people have an obligation. That doesn't mean that we shouldn't encourage it. I will point out that the

ICANN booth had lots of NCUC brochures and none from At-Large, including LACRALO which was the region it was being held in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, if I may, the NCUC printed their own brochures, they brought their own brochures in their luggage. They got their own booth without the help of ICANN, and they basically made their impact. I don't think anyone funded them to do that, and they might have been funded for appearing in some workshop, but of all the people that came into the booth, most of them were not funded in any way. And I'd like to see the same sort of thing happen with us. Maybe we rely a bit too much on ICANN for these things.

ALAN GREENBERG: There were brochures at the ICANN booth also.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It meant going from the NCUC booth to the ICANN booth and dropping them over there, but we didn't even have brochures. And I'm still trying to find out what happened to those brochures, by the way that were supposed to be there.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was the point I was making, Olivier. Wafa, please.

WAFA DAHMANI: Yes, thank you, Alan. I just wanted to speak about my experience in the IGF. I was a remote panelist. I participated in two workshops. The main workshop was about enhancing multilingual and diversity in the cyberspace.

I tried to link that to the IDNs and how we have to promote these resources to enhance multilingual and cultural diversity, and I was also a speaker in the workshop about Internet governance in the [inaudible] region. I presented my perspective about the challenge I'm facing in the Internet governance [inaudible]. That's what I wanted to say.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next, we have Abdeldjalil. We cannot hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: He's on the French track.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we will wait or the interpreter.

INTERPRETER: I am not hearing anything yet.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: It was the first time that I was able to participate in the IGF. It was a great experience. I was there, it was a great opportunity. It was a new

experience for me, and the recommendations that I would say is that we do need to have a booth, just like the NCUC.

As ALAC member, as the community, we do need to have a booth. Of course, you have the ICANN booth, etc., but I think that the other thing that we could do is to organize an informal meeting for all of the ALAC members to meet, to talk and so forth.

And also what I would like to propose is a question and answer session, a forum so that people might get to know ALAC and so forth, because we need to be introduced to the community, because we are the voice of the end users, so our voice needs to be heard.

INTERPRETER: Abdeldjalil is done. I'm sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Is he finished, or still talking?

INTERPRETER: I think he's finished.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much. Yes, he says he is finished. Alright, we have managed to take a meeting that I thought was going to end after 90 minutes and use up the full two hours, and I think very productively. It's been a very good meeting, I'll thank everyone for attending.

It was great to see non-ALAC and liaison people on the call. We had a good number of people, including from NARALO, AFRALO and LACRALO, and that's delightful to see. So, I thank everyone for attending, I thank the interpreters for their valiant effort, and we'll see you. I wish you all a good holiday season for those of you who celebrate, and see you in the new year.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Bye.

SEUN OJEDEJI.   Bye, thank you. [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye, everybody.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]