
GISELLA GRUBER: Okay. We will now officially get the recording started. Hopefully everyone is able to hear us. Welcome back, first everyone from Hyderabad. I hope you all had a safe journey back, for those who attended. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team mid-monthly call on Tuesday, the 29th of November, at 21:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Holly Raiche, Veronica Cretu, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, Maureen Hilyard, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and Alfredo Calderon. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yeşim Nazlar, and myself, Gisella Gruber. No apologies today.

If I could just remind everyone to please state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. And welcome, Veronica, to your first ALT call.

VERONICA CRETU: Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. First of all, yes, welcome to Veronica. I'm sorry we won't hear your beautiful voice today, but perhaps another day. I will comment on the fact that we're having a mid-monthly call on the

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.

29th of the month, which brings something into question. I'm not quite sure what.

Nevertheless, this looks like it's going to be a pretty full call, so we're going to try to go as quickly as possible so we don't run over. I have another meeting, hard-on, after this one, as I suspect other people might as well. Well, maybe not. So we will have to end on time. So we're going to go as quickly as possible, and first into the policy development activities.

Ariel, if we could have an update, specifically on things that require our attention.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. The first thing that requires ALAC attention is the draft statement of the Phase II Assessment of the Competitive Effects Associated with the New gTLD Program. Holly just drafted a statement and it's open for comment until December the 5th. I'll put the link in the chat. There has been quite a lot of comments so far, so I will invite all of you to read that draft statement and provide your input by December the 5th. We do need to submit it on December the 6th because that's the closing date for public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Someday we're going to have to get our act together and actually get these things done in time so we can have a vote or a consensus call before we submit. But I guess that won't be this week.

Please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: The next one that requires ALAC attention is the Continuous Data-Driven Analysis of Root Server Systems Stability Draft Report. We do have quite a bit of time for that draft statement. The closing date for public comment is on the 22nd of December. The draft statement is already ready to review, and it was developed by Seun and John Laprise.

ALAN GREENBERG: Very good.

ARIEL LIANG: The next one that requires a decision – the first one is the Draft PTI FY18 Operating Plan and Budget. I contacted Mohamed and asked him whether ALAC should issue a statement on that, but he hasn't replied. The public comment close date is December the 10th.

ALAN GREENBERG: When did you ask Mohamed?

ARIEL LIANG: I think two weeks ago and yesterday again.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's problematic if he hasn't replied in two weeks. Please try to get hold of him. Maybe I need to point out that, as our official representative on the CSC, he does need to advise us on these things.

Let me know if you get hold of him tomorrow or not.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. And Tijani has raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. We can hear you well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. This is to tell you that I attended the finance workshop in Hyderabad. I discussed, especially, the PTI budget. I can confirm that there is nothing to add, except that – I don't know if you know this, Alan – the root zone maintainer contract with the Verisign [they do a lot of] contracts with NTIA, and now it is costly. [We] would pay money for it. This is [inaudible] I have on this budget, and I think that we don't need to comment on it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that was made public when the original contract was being discussed; that it would be a for-pay contract at this point. So that's not

a surprise. I'm not sure the amount was mentioned at that point, but everything else...

Is Mohamed with you at your meeting, by the way?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, Mohamed wasn't there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Mohamed wasn't in Hyderabad at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, no. I'm talking about the meeting you're at right now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible] the amount is announced yet there. I don't have it on the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: It doesn't really matter. I don't think it impacts anything.

No, I was asking if he was at the meeting that you're at right now. I thought that might be a quicker way to get hold of him than Ariel calling him.

Back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The next one is the new public comment. It's the updated Supplementary Procedures for the Independent Review Process (IRP). That just opened yesterday and it will close on January the 10th.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone have any thoughts on whether we want to comment on that? A few people have been heavily involved in the discussions. Certainly they have gone through the CCWG Plenary. Any feelings on whether we want to comment on this?

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. As you know, I'm not a big supporter of "Hey, yeah. We like this, too" – type comments. But I think under this one, we probably should make a small, short, affirmative, supportive comment because it is so critical and because it would reflect on our activity as it ties into our community.

The reason is twofold. The radical changes brought about by the new IRP process – and you're correct; it has gone through, I think, more than enough due diligence from the community point of view. I think it's almost farcical to take it out to public comment, but that's just my "I have better things to do" attitude. Perhaps some of you share that. I don't know.

But in the main response to complaints we've had over the years – so I think the At-Large community via the ALAC should at least have itself on the record. That's all. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I too am not a fan of “Yay, yay. We support this,” unless we think there are going to be strong comments – negative – from other people. If someone would like to volunteer to draft this, then I am certainly willing to put it forward to the ALAC.

Go ahead, Tijani. Can't hear you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I am an official member of...

You don't hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can hear you now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. One moment, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Long time lag.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Now it is okay. No, no. Because you will have an echo if I don't disable the other channel.

Okay. I am an official member of the Implementation Team, which is mentioned in the bylaws for the IRP.

Do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: We heard you several times, but keep speaking.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So I followed all the discussions, and I can tell you that ALAC should, in my point of view, support these supplemental procedures because it is very important for this [inaudible].

There is a very big problem of echo.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani, I think we understand what you're saying. You're recommending that we do put a statement in supporting it. Do we have a volunteer to draft something?

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure that Tijani has finished yet, but hopefully I'm not speaking across him. Okay. Now I have an echo from myself.

Anyway, I was just going to suggest that, because Tijani is so active in the implementation, perhaps it would be appropriate – because he has been at arm’s length, although deeply involved – that we ask Leon to briefly pen the appropriate documentation. I’m not just saying that because, obviously, he hasn’t managed to get his dial-out to him. And he’s not actually in the AC room. [laughter]

I mean, he might be in the dial-out. I don’t know if he’s on audio only, but I would have thought we could have thrown that one at him. It’s only going to be a paragraph’s worth.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Ariel, can you mark Leon down as the tentative author of the short statement? If there’s a problem with that, get back to me and we’ll go resolve it.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Alan, this is Leon.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Go ahead, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks. I was actually going to volunteer for that. I thank Cheryl for doing that on my behalf. It’s just that I have a little bit of background noise here and I [inaudible] problem. So I put my hand up.

So, yes, do count on me. I will draft something for us to review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Ariel, back to you now. We're starting to run out of time, so can you finish up whatever else we have to do?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The last one is on the proposed ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. The public comment will end on January the 12th, and then Olivier and Sébastien already started commenting on the public comment. So I wonder whether we should just ask Olivier and Sébastien to co-draft something on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll take that advice. Please go ahead with that.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. And that's it for public comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Any other comments on public comments before we go onto the next item on the agenda?

Seeing nothing and hearing nothing, the next item on the agenda is updates from liaisons. We didn't have a really good opportunity to do this at the end of the Hyderabad meeting. Our closing meeting ended up being a bit abbreviated.

If we can go around, is there anything to report in terms of actions that we need to take or any other initiatives that are going on within these groups that we should know about?

Maureen first, if you can.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I put up a report on the liaison page. There has been nothing of note that happened since Hyderabad with respect to any decisions or discussions [inaudible] together again for [ccNSO]. I will work [inaudible] with anything that comes [inaudible]. Is this in relation to [inaudible] – [inaudible]? I've been interested to see if [we can flunk out of] that one, but I don't think there is [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Leadership in the ccNSO stays the same this year?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, [inaudible]. There is one thing. They had put out a call for a ccNSO liaison person. I haven't seen anyone [inaudible] yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Liaison to the ALAC?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, to the ALAC. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right. Thank you, Maureen. Yrjö, you're on the call, I see. Anything to report at this point?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. Briefly, the ALAC had a meeting with the GAC in Hyderabad. The themes were [new gTLD] diversity. Sandra gave an update on ICANN [inaudible] efforts as such, and then comparing how ALAC and GAC take their responsibilities in the Empowered Community.

I would like to highlight one point here. The Council of Europe, which is an up-server for the GAC, presented their report entitled “Applications to ICANN for Community-Based New Generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs).” Mark Carvell is the U.K representative to the GAC. He was quite excited about this, and so were some other GAC members as well.

One of the items taken up, actually, at the joint ALAC-GAC meeting – I think that there is hope from both sides that, after reading this report, GAC and ALAC will discuss this in Copenhagen because I think that there is a lot of stuff that both could agree on. And that would be stuff for joint statements on this new gTLD question.

The Council of Europe is ready to send hard copies of this document to ALAC members. They just need postal addresses. We talked about that with Heidi. I’d like to know whether we can actually get those addresses to the Council of Europe. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I did ask Heidi. We do need a full set of addresses of contact information for all ALAC members, and that includes a mailing address. Heidi was going to collect that or have someone collect all of that

information and providing the mailing address to whoever it was. I don't recall who was actually going to mail them out.

Heidi, is that under control, or will it be?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It will be under control.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Shortly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think there's an action item there somewhere.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, it was an action item. If you could just give me one moment to follow up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. It doesn't really matter on this call, as long as it is in process – partly for getting the hard copies to people, but partly just so we have a complete set of contact information. There are occasions where we have to call people or do other things, and it's better not to have to run around at that point and establish contact information.

Anything else, Yrjö?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO

No. I think this is all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Cheryl? As our new repeated and new-again GNSO liaison...
Have we lost Ms. Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I hope not. I just hadn't taken myself off mute.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

My apologies. Can you hear me now? I believe you can.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We can.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Excellent. I was just saying, "Rinse and repeat" on this. For anything that happens before the end of the Hyderabad meeting, I would look forward to getting that from Olivier because he attended the GNSO Council meeting up until that point in time. I, in fact, only attended half of one because I was, as were many of the other sitting Councilors, required to be on one of the high-interest topic afternoons that did

clash with the [slick] meeting schedule that was running. So for going backwards, I'd look towards him.

But, briefly, for going forward, I wanted to – and I'll take the opportunity now – mention to you that we have the next Council meeting on the first of December. The agenda is out. I just wanted to make sure that I ran the vote actions past you all to see if there's anything you wanted me to take to the table on your behalf.

The first one is the recommendation about the GNSO Bylaw Drafting Team. We chose not to make a public comment on that. I am assuming, unless you tell me otherwise, that we're not going to make a comment at the table on the vote either. But let me know if that's not the case.

There's also a response that the GNSO will be voting on with relation to the GAC communique out of Hyderabad. Again, that is something I'll suggest I would report to you about as opposed to take something to the discussion for.

There's a letter going to the ICANN Board concerning implementation issues with Part C of the Inter-Registry Transfer Policy. If memory serves, we also chose not to comment on that. So unless you tell me otherwise, I would remain silent on that matter and just keep you updated on what happens.

There's the implementation plan for recommendation – and it's only some recommendations – from the 2014 GNSO review. Again, whilst many of us were part of that review process, we had remained silent in terms of comments from public commentary. I'm assuming you'll want

me to do that and maintain just a watching brief and return to you if there's anything to update.

There is a bit of work on RDS. Again, I would think that is something we would be able to report back to us rather than put input at the Council table.

There is, however, the important matter, which I may, with your permission, encourage them to do so in a timely manne – and that is they're going to discuss the responses to the questions to the CCWG Accountability Co-Chairs; questions which of course are the questions that have gone out on behalf of the work team that I'm a co-rapporteur in.

So with your permission, I might encourage them to do that in a timely manner and at least get something in by mid-December, if not everything in by mid-December. Tell me if you want me to shut about it, though, if not.

They've a few administrative things such as their appointments to assess our review team and planning for ICANN 58. On planning for ICANN 58, however, [phone ringing] I do want to report from discussions an encouragement – somebody's certainly not on mute – by a couple of Councilors to do two policy meetings and the AGM. So it would be two Helsinki-style meetings.

I'm not sure they're suggesting a change in the time allocated in the A, B, and C; but rather that they take the next ICANN meeting more as a piece of policy work than anything else. So I'll keep a watching brief on that for you.

Other than that, I will eventually get around to updating the wiki. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A couple of things. On the very latter thing, yes, ICANN is trying to find a name for the A meeting because the new CEO has forbidden them to call it the A meeting.

My only concern with calling it a policy forum is that then we will have silly rules about who can and cannot schedule meetings and what we are allowed to discuss at the meeting, as we did in Helsinki. If that happens again, I'm going to get very upset.

CHERYLL LANGDON-ORR:

I will make that point if the opportunity arises, then.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I personally think it should be called ICANN Classic, after Coke Classic, which was a recovery from a disaster. But nevertheless, we'll see where that one goes. I don't much care what the name is. I do care about arbitrary rules that go along because of the name we pick. I will get very vociferous on that.

In terms of suggesting that they answer the questions that were posed by the AC/SO Accountability Group, you can certainly do that wearing your hat as Co-Chair of that group. Once you put that hat on, you're a free agent to speak with that hat at the meeting. So that's certainly within your realm.

I have one question for you, however. With the WHOIS/RDS review – the AoC/now-called-“specific reviews” under the bylaws – there was general acceptance in the AC/SO Chairs to do the abbreviated review; that is, just do a post-mortem of the implementation of WHOIS Review Team 1.

The only negative comment came, I believe from – I don’t remember who now. Someone in the GSNO stood up and made a negative comment about. When James was asked, he said, “Well, there has been one negative comment,” so he can’t approve it yet. It would be nice if the GNSO would either come down and approve it or disapprove it because one person said no, so we can get on with selecting people for that review.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, if I may, I can reassure you that, from my reading of Item 8 on the Council agenda, that is exactly what is intended to happen. It refers to the circulated document that you referred to, dated the 4th of November. It refers to discussions that happened in ICANN 57 in terms of high-interest topic sessions, and it notes certain concerns with the proposal noted by the GNSO Council during its wrap-up session.

Its aim in that agenda item is to discuss and confirm [inaudible] if any concerning the process, limited-scope of the RDS review. So I think your wish will come true there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My recollection is that it was Susan Kawaguchi that made the comment. I'm not 100% sure, but I think so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that would be the case because the update and summary is being conducted by James and by Susan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. She may have infinite resources within Facebook. The rest of us don't. So certainly from the At-Large point of view, I don't see how we could staff a full review team at this point with the people who we have that are knowledgeable in that subject. So I sincerely hope they do not throw a wrench in – or a spanner, as I think is the expression – into this one.

Next we'll call on Julie Hammer for SSAC.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Alan, but I just note that Holly has her hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah.

JULIE HAMMER: Or did.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No longer. We'll go back to her if necessary.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you. Okay. SSAC hasn't met since Hyderabad, but Maureen specifically asks whether anything further had happened on the interaction with ccNSO on the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel topic. I think you'll recall that I've sent to the ALAC – the SSAC, if you like – interim response on the 7th of November, which was during the Hyderabad meeting, and said, "We'll go back and look at this one further. We think there may have been misunderstandings on both sides. We'll reply within four weeks."

I'm not on that work party, so I haven't actually got any visibility of what's been happening to look into that further and develop a response. And I probably won't do that until a draft response is ready to be circulated to the whole SSAC.

So I apologize to Maureen. I don't have any visibility on that. The SSAC meeting isn't until the 8th of December, but I might just make an inquiry in the background just to see if I can find out where that's at.

The only other thing I've mentioned that's been happening in SSAC since Hyderabad is that I've actually done the first draft of the SSAC answers to the SO/AC Accountability questions to all SOs and ACs and for CCWG Accountability. Staff has had a quick look at that. One of the other SSAC members, Russ Mundy, is having a quick look at it at the moment. So I'm hoping that we'll have our reply to those questions in on time.

The other good news is that we've actually seen an e-mail from Lyman Chapin drafted by himself. He's not back up to full strength yet. I know a lot of you know and have great respect and admiration for Lyman, so I thought you'd be interested to know that his recovery is going pretty well. But it'll still be a while.

Any questions?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No questions from me. Holly has her hand up. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

If you've finished with Julie, that's fine. I just wanted to make a comment about WHOS and RDAP and RDS.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Since you have the mic, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Cheryl, what I hope you would bring back to the GNSO is the very strong message that was given in Hyderabad. In the high-interest thing, when they talked about the WHOIS review, lots of speakers, including my good self, got up and said, "You must be joking. Do we really need another WHOIS issue?"

The conclusion that I got was that there was – first of all, the statement from a Board member who was there, who said, "Look, we're tracking

what's going on anyway. Why are we reviewing?" which I thought was a very sensible statement.

The other is, okay, the AoC said we had to have a review every four years. I would like – and I think everybody who is working on WHOIS would like – whatever terms of reference there are on a review confined as narrowly as possible so, essentially, it just becomes, "Take a few boxes and get it over with" so that all the other WHOIS stuff can actually take up our time.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And that is exactly what is proposed.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm free with it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, my only concern is someone is going to say "No," and therefore the whole world will start listening to the no-er.

Julie, just one quick comment, not on your report. During a new gTLD sub-group meeting, yesterday I think, there was a lot of discussion on: should we allow single characters? Should we allow dashes and names? Should we allow a variety of other things?

I said, "Instead of us just hypothesizing on whether they're good or bad, maybe we should ask SSAC to either bring out any past reports they had

or do a new review of something it if hasn't in fact been looked at in the past." So SSAC may be getting a request like that from the Co-Chairs of the gTLD PDP.

Anything else, Julie, before we go onto the next item? We are running just a little bit late, but we're close.

The one comment that was made, Julie, by the way, was that perhaps your agenda for 2017 is already full and wouldn't get to it. I hope that will not be the case, but I will leave it for SSAC to negotiate with the PDP.

Next item is At-Large review. We have a five-minute item from Holly and Cheryl on a status update, and I look forward to that. Who is speaking?

HOLLY RAICHE: I will be coming from me, if that's all right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I have checked informally. The draft final report is due out December 5th. After that stage, I think we better convene a working party meeting to gather some comments together. After that, clearly, we'll be involving the whole of ALAC.

But, yeah, the next step really is to wait until December 5th or 6th. At that stage, I think the executive on the the working party will start mapping where we go from here. But we do have some deadlines in front of them that I've probably repeated enough.

Cheryl, got anything to add?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nothing to add.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Some of the consultants met after or at the end of the Hyderabad meeting. Has anyone gotten any clues as to what it is they're focusing on?

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't; I've asked. Or rather, reverse the order. I've asked; I don't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Any other questions or comments?

We have got back our time now. Next item is Item 6, BCEC/BMSPC updates. There was an e-mail that came out today on behalf of Julie. Does either Julie or Tijani have anything to report at this point?

JULIE HAMMER: Alan, nothing further from me. The committee is working hard on those applications. I think that's about all I can say at the moment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani? Is there anything you need to say or perhaps type? Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Okay. Thank you, Alan. Yes, I read the e-mail exchange. I think that we shouldn't say anything about that. It is really [inaudible], not only for this case but in other cases. I don't want to comment on it. [inaudible] go like this, which is better.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It's just a stock item here in case there was anything to report. No obligation. We'll complete that.

The next item is CCWG on accountability and an update on the replies to questions. It is listed as me and Leon. I think it's actually probably Cheryl who asked for it to be on. I don't think these questions have been addressed to the wider group, to people outside of the CCWG work group.

Cheryl, do you want to give a three-sentence introduction? Then we'll try to figure out who's going to do the groundwork.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Happy to. Here I'm putting on my hat as one of the co-rapporteurs of the group that has put these questions out. These are questions that have gone to all of the ACs and SOs. They are questions which I believe ALAC, with the assistance of staff, I'm sure, is in a good position to quickly respond to. I'm a little disturbed that we haven't got ahead of it already, but I'm sure we can do it in enough time.

The questions themselves are about a self-assessment on our accountability that also go to asking us who we see we are accountable to. Now, we could speak purely to the bylaws – and we've quoted which bylaws are referenced to each of us here – but we would hope that each of the ACs and SOs will say what actually is written in the rules and what is actual practice.

That'll do, I think, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm happy to do a first draft, with the support of staff, on that. If anyone feels that's inappropriate, then speak up. But other than that, I think that's probably the most expedient way to get closure on this unless anyone else has any strong feelings otherwise.

And you will note I'm very rarely volunteering to write things these days.

Everyone okay with it? I see no tic marks, but I don't hear anyone shouting no. We'll take that as a given and put that an action item for me, please.

Next item: Post-ICANN 55 debrief. We have a fair amount of time for this, but it's rather unstructured, with one exception. I'd like to take Item C – the one exception – first, and decide how to go forward on that.

Several ALAC meetings ago, we decided we would not worry about revitalizing all of our work groups, but that we would get the gTLD one going. We also have to get the registration services one going, but the gTLD one is what I'd like to talk about today.

In Hyderabad, we did have a number of volunteers or people who were volunteered for it. Three names that I remember were mentioned, and not in any specific order, were John Laprise, Seun Ojedeji, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond. It was at one point suggested that Seun and Olivier would be Co-Chairs of it.

John volunteered himself. He doesn't have a lot of experience, but he's, I suspect, probably a pretty good Chair. I don't have any personal knowledge of that, but I just suspect that is the case.

I believe there would be a significant problem with Seun acting as Chair – not from a skill set, but on connectivity issues. I wonder if anyone else here has any thoughts on how we move forward on this.

Anyone? Including Olivier, whose name was mentioned in vain? Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Very well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. I think that the best way or a potential solution would be to also have John as one of the Co-Chairs. The reason is because I feel uneasy about not being able to have any African Chairs on working groups because of connectivity issues. I think it's detrimental to the region itself. It's detrimental to people in Africa because it's basically telling them, "Well, just because your connectivity isn't good enough, it's going to be hard for you to be a Chair. So you can't be a Chair."

I would certainly wish that Seun can remain one of the Co-Chairs. If he has a problem with running a meeting because he doesn't have the connectivity that's necessary for running the meeting, then one of the other Co-Chairs can do it. But in the meantime, he can assume Co-Chair duties that don't require him to be online.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Before going to the next speaker, I will point out that the next speaker is African and chairs an awful lot of meetings. Tijani, I'll open the floor to you. [laughing]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I agree with Olivier because we are building now new leaders, in my point of view, from those young people. Seun is one of those people who can be a good leader in the future. So if we don't give him the opportunity to chair a group or to co-chair a group...

The good thing is that we have other Co-Chairs, so it is not necessary that he chairs a meeting while he doesn't have connectivity.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. I will point out that Seun has done a lot of chairing in other capacities outside of ICANN. It's not as if he's new to the concept. If people are happy with two Co-Chairs with the understanding that one of them may have more trouble co-chairing and that those duties fall upon the other Co-Chair, I have no problem with it at all.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. For the record, Seun used to be the Chair of the PDP Working Group on AFRINIC for several years, and now is a member of the Board of AFRINIC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. That is what I was referring to.

All right. So I will make a recommendation to the ALAC that. I'll check with the two individuals first, privately. If they're agreeable, then I will suggest to the ALAC to appoint them.

I hope we're not going to find out that the ALAC, at this point, says we should have an open call for volunteers. I think for things like Chairs of working groups, we have to...

Well, the last time there was a suggestion like that, that was the answer. Hopefully, we can actually make some decisions.

All right. If you can take it as an action item from me to try to firm up the Chairs or Co-Chairs for the gTLD Working Group.

All right. Back to the more general topic of the ICANN 57 "what worked well, what didn't work well." I wouldn't mind going around the table for some very brief comments on just how well they think the meeting has gone and what items we need to firm up.

The meeting, in case it wasn't obvious, was chaos from the point of view of scheduling. We were changing days around and meetings around, literally, after we arrived in Hyderabad. That being said, I think the meetings went off moderately well. But I'd like to think we're never going to have to do it at that level like that again.

We have several hands, or at least one hand. Tijani, go ahead. And then Heidi.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I think that the meeting went more or less well, despite the fact of this mess of scheduling. My big concern is that the scheduling has always been a problem, but we never reached this level of problems at the meeting. So in the future, it is only to get the lessons. In the future, I propose that we work the schedule enough ahead of the meeting and we don't change anything of the schedule during the meeting because it was a real mess.

For me, for example, I was confused. I was in a meeting and then I learned that an ALAC meeting was scheduled. So I had to leave the other meeting and come to ALAC's. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani, just to be clear, ICANN Meetings Team was still rearranging meetings... On the week I left for Hyderabad, the days before that, they were still rearranging meetings.

Moreover, there were other meetings that were scheduled against out meetings that were not on the agenda until after we got to Hyderabad. Or at least we didn't seem them on the agenda until after we got to Hyderabad.

So this wasn't all that we were doing things late. The world was moving around us in a completely unprecedented way so late in the schedule.

Now, we have been told that that will not happen again. There is a kickoff meeting to talk about scheduling this Thursday, but we're getting very mixed messages. We were told in Hyderabad that there would be a survey asking how we should organize the meetings in December, but

that before that, we would have block schedule for the meeting. I'm not quite how we have a block schedule for the meeting before we decide what the meeting should look like.

In any case, we have several hands up. Heidi next, and then Holly.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi, Alan. Thank you. Just a suggestion on how we may collect these very valuable comments. At-Large staff has decided to create a wiki page where we look at some of the issues that we encountered – challenges and issues. [inaudible] some details of what the issue was and then how we can improve. We've put that onto our restricted wiki page so we can talk about it as a team. I'm wondering if ALT would like a similar workspace to be posted while we collect these comments.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You're talking about a staff-only wiki page?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

No. For the ALT, it would be public, but –

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, no, no. The one you were talking about that you have created or will create – for staff only?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. It's basically just so At-Large staff can – anything that would concern us in particular. But on your feedback, this is a really important topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there any reason to limit it to the ALT?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Absolutely not. This could be something that could be opened up to anybody attending a meeting or–

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the whole At-Large leadership group, or even the travelers group... I have no strong feelings either way. I would think the wider, the better. Clearly, only some people will comment, but I don't see any reason to limit it.

Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: A couple of things. I think the first thing is that I would like at some point to take a great big step back because the way we schedule ourselves on the first couple of days, we're solidly in meetings. But so often, those meetings clash with the important policy meetings. And it just means we either attend the meetings, which seem to be where we should be – or at least I get that impression – or we attend policy meetings.

That becomes a little bit difficult. So I don't know how to deal with that, but it's just a point I've felt where sometimes I knew that I was sitting in an ALAC meeting and I really, in terms of policy, thought I should be sitting in another meeting.

The other comment – and it's just a placeholder – is that I have no idea what the At-Large review is going to say, but I suspect they're also going to having something to say about meeting schedules. Let's just keep a little placeholder for that.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I think at some point we had to address, with specifically the GNSO and with staff, this concept that GNSO PDPs are open to everyone. Anyone can participate, but then when there's a face-to-face meeting, they're scheduled against other things. It's really fine to say anyone can come if they choose, but it's just not practical in some cases.

I think we have a real problem there and I don't quite know how to address it, but I think we have to address it. Cheryl, maybe you and I can talk privately and see how we address that to the GNSO.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I am really happy to know that staff will make a survey about how the community wants or imagines the meetings' organization because this is something that I requested at the

beginning, just after the Meeting Strategy Working Group finished its work, and it was refused by the staff.

So now I hope that this will be the solution; that the format at any kind of scheduling will be the sum of the desire of the whole community so that you will not have this kind of mess.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Any other comments? I'm still not quite sure how they're going to create the block diagram prior to doing the survey, but nevertheless.

Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Again, I wasn't suggesting a survey. I was suggesting a workspace that allowed –

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, no.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi, it's the overall meetings staff who are doing the survey.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, okay. So what I suggested was just basically for At-Large meetings. Obviously, it would include things that had to do with ICANN meetings – the ICANN team, etc. – but this is something where, basically, just issues that we could see if we could work towards solving.

If we had columns for 57, 58, and 59, we could see if there any trends and see if there any improvements in one year.

ALAN GREENBERG: No conflict. These are two different actions.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Any other further comments on the meetings? I will keep you informed as to what's happening. There's a Chairs' kickoff meeting on Thursday.

Olivier, were RALO Chairs also invited to that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: To the Thursday meeting? This Thursday?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have not received any invitation. No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I wasn't sure who was invited to it. ICANN staff seemed to go back and forth between which Chairs are included in which meetings. It's getting a little bit confusing.

All right. Any further comments on the ICANN 57 post-mortem?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry. I'm just looking at my calendar. It looks like I might have received a calendar invite, actually, after all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. [laughing]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But you know what it is. They just send calendar invites and I forwarded it over to my Google and it just adds itself. So, yes, RALO Chairs are invited in this. I think we received half-a-dozen calendar invites with different times and stuff. Hopefully the right times.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, it was first scheduled for the middle of the IGF meeting next week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Yeah, well done.]

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. But it is now on Thursday. All right. Next item on our agenda is ALS expectations. We adopted –

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes? Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, but there was one more item on the review of action items.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh. I'm sorry. I missed that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: From ICANN 57.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead and do that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Gisella, could you please put the action items up? And I'll go ahead and put them into the chat so you can take a look at them.

Now, there are a lot, so prepare yourselves. I'm having issues to get this...

There we go. Thank you, Ariel.

Okay. Alan, do you wish to go through them? Again, basically they are divided by meetings, so you can just choose to go through the At-Large ones, the ALAC ones.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like to go through the At-Large ones, not the other specific meetings. And I would like you to lead us.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you. First I will start some of the At-Large leadership [inaudible] sessions on the first day. I'm not going to distinguish between the various ones. Basically I'll just add...

Should I go through all of them or just the ones that concern the ALT members?

ALAN GREENBERG: The ones you think need our action or that we need to know something about it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. A lot of these are just basically for organizing calls, etc. There is one for you, Alan. It is for you to add the ALs analysis paper, "The Goal of Having One ALS per Country." That is...

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a sub-item of the next item on our agenda.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I'll skip. Then: "ALAC to discuss with the project management team about the UX/UI designer resources to make the website more mobile friendly. Is that something that you want to pursue to give to the TTF?"

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the TTF.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Ariel, if you could note that, please. Just in the notes.

Okay. Olivier, one I know that is close to your heart is for you and Sally to work together on the sponsorship issues to facilitate introductions. You may see her at the IGF. I'm not sure if Sally is going, but it might be something you wish to discuss with her in person.

Okay. One is for Sébastien to draft a position paper or proposal requesting the ICANN Board to consider initiating a periodic review of the multi-stakeholder model to evaluate the overall composition and balance of stakeholder representation in relation to their decision-making requirement in ICANN.

And once that is ready, the ALAC will review the draft. This was connected to the ATLAS II Recommendations 7 and 13.

Okay. Just continue. There was one in the wrap-up session: I'm to organize a webinar with relevant IT staff on ICANN strategy. I have to say that I do not recall that, so is there some guidance there on what exactly that means and what timeframe we would like that webinar?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone have any recollection of what that meant?

May I suggest in the future that, when we do note action items, we note the time so it's easier to go back to the recording and figure out what things meant?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. I can see if I can look at the transcript for that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Please. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. The remaining ones are from the ALT meeting. Alan, a lot are for you. They are for you to raise the issue with ALAC regarding the ATRT recommendation on supporting non-industry participants.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible], yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Holly, there is one for you to coordinate ICANN informative sessions, or information sessions, with the Next-Gens and Fellows over the next few months and then report back to the ALT. Okay?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You may wish to work the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee, because I know that Dev feels that that sort of is in their remit.

Okay. Then Alan and I...

HOLLY RAICHE: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: There are a lot of people who are involved in the different aspects, and I think this was about a coordination. It arose out of my training or my own little personal program. The idea was, "Well, everybody is doing bits and pieces that possibly are completely repetitive. Let's actually pool resources and pool people and have some kind of coordination." Because, even though my sessions went well, we shouldn't be doing this if everybody else is doing a very similar version of the same thing. So it's really pulling together who's doing what.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Holly, would you like to suggest that Dev has this item on the next regional and engagement subcommittee?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll just have an e-mail with him and say, "Look, this is what we're doing. How do you want to manage?" because Maureen is also doing stuff and the Fellows are doing stuff. There's a lot going on, and a lot of it is just overlapping. So it's silly to have sessions, many of which are doing the same thing. But I will speak with Dev. Okay?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. You might want to include Siranush in that, too.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Perfect. Next one is for Alan and myself to find the current document describing ALAC requirements to the NomCom and pass by ALAC to see if any modifications need to be brought to them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That should be on the NomCom pages. But when you find out what's there, check with me to see if it's the last one I sent them or not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And, Alan and/or the ALT to set up a meeting in Copenhagen and with five NomCom representatives/appointees to meet either with the ALT or ALAC.

Is that just a forward AI to keep in mind?

Finally, is for Alan and the ALT to continue discussion on details on how we meet with NomCom leadership and ALAC appointees. [inaudible] group to be formed. Olivier and possibly the ALAC Chair. I think those are connected.

ALAN GREENBERG: The words say "ex-NomCom officio," not Olivier.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Take a look. Just refresh, please. I've cleaned them up on the AI page.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I shouldn't be looking at what's in the Adobe Connect.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, not at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I foolishly thought that—

HEIDI ULLRICH: I cleaned them up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. I cleaned them up on the AI page.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And that was it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments on these?

Seeing nothing, the next item is ALS expectations. You will recall that I had drafted the document we discussed and adopted in principle, which essentially put out a two-directional process.

Number one, yes, we want input from ALSs, but as a prerequisite of that, we have to provide much better information going out. The suggestion was that that document be refined by a small group.

I know Tijani volunteered for it. I'm going to suggest that I put out a call to the At-Large leadership, to the ALAC list, asking for volunteers. Is there anyone who feels that is not the way to go? The alternative, perhaps, is to identify specific people.

Veronica says, "Count me in." Can you please note that, please?

All right. Hearing nothing else, I will send a message out to one of the ALAC lists, and we will try to get that going pretty soon.

If there was someone else who volunteered that I forgot about, other than Tijani – who volunteered during the discussion – please let me know.

All right. The next discussion is on upcoming new groups. We have a number of groups that are being formed soon. There's the CCWG Auctions. A call for nominations will be coming out in the next, I'm guessing, days or a week or so on that one.

There is the SSR Review Team, which I think we now have closure on who has applied for it and how they're going to be evaluated. I'm not 100% sure on that. Once I can determine from ICANN staff where we

are on that, then we'll do an ALAC appointee selection committee to make some decisions and recommendations to the ALAC on that.

I was hoping that we would have closure on the other items so that I could merge them into a single meeting and not have to have too many separate meetings for the selection committee, but it looks like that's not going to be possible.

As we already discussed, with the RDS one, we may have closure soon on what the subject is. It is rather unfortunate that the staff did a call for volunteers before we knew what the subject was. Therefore, we are likely to have a significant number of volunteers who do not meet the criteria for the abbreviated review. It's not clear how we're handling that. Staff is aware of the problem.

Someone was speaking. I think it was Holly, but I'm not sure.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I was groaning at the thought, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you very much. I don't think I have anything else to say on that other than that there's going to be a fair amount of activity. And, of course, this will all come back to the ALAC for either ratification or decisions.

Are there any other groups that I've forgotten that we're expecting to be formed in the next little while? There's an ATRT 3, but that one is still

a little bit out, so I don't think there's much discussion of that yet. I'm not sure if there's closure on exactly what the subject matter is, even.

Any comments? Questions? All right.

There is an item that we have to go back to, Item 2 – welcome and introduction – that I didn't do. This is the first meeting of the ALT for this new ICANN year, and according to the new changes to the rules of procedure, you will recall that we now have the concept of advisors to the ALT, which consist of the liaisons to the ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees. That's our four liaisons.

The rules also allow the Chair to invite other people to act as advisors with the agreement of the ALT. I would like to, for this coming year, include our two past Chairs, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Olivier Crépin-Leblond, as advisors to the ALT in this capacity. If there's anyone who objects to that, then I would like to know that now.

I see no objection. I hear no voices. Then that is done.

Our next item on the agenda is an in-camera session for a personnel discussion that will be limited to the ALAC–

[HOLLY RAICHE]:

I'm just waiting for confirmation for [inaudible]. Thank you. The recording is back on. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. The ALT and advisors met to discuss a personnel issue. There were not decisions taken, and no decisions will be taken by this group. It was just for the information of all people involved in this group.

We now have Any Other Business. Is there anyone else who has anything? Seeing nothing, we will call the meeting to a close, three-and-a-half minutes early. Thank you, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]