
GISELLA GRUBER: Good afternoon, good morning, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team monthly call—mid-monthly call (apologies) on Wednesday, 11th of January, 21:30 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, Maureen Hilyard, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crepin-Leblond. No apologies. We have a full house. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Evin Erdogan and Yeşim Nazlar, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. As was pointed out before, the recording's started. We have a packed agenda. I have a request from Heidi for a moment or so before we start the formal agenda, and I'll turn it over to Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much, Alan. I'll just make it very quick. I wanted to just take this opportunity to welcome Evin Erdogan. She is on our call, learning the ropes as AC/SO Coordinator. She's our new staff member, as you all know. And among her responsibilities will be supporting ALAC and some of the ALSs, and working a little bit with Silvia, for the most part.

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.

She is a graduate of Boston University, where she studied International Relations, and she also received a certificate of distinction in Nonprofit Leadership and Management from Rice University. She is based in Istanbul office and is fluent in English and Turkish. Welcome, Evin. Do you want to say just a few words of hello?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Hi, yes. Hello everyone. Thank you so much for the kind introduction, Heidi and Gisella. It's an absolute delight and an honor to be working for ICANN. It's an organization I've been following for many years through my international relations studies, and then just my nerdy online hobbies. And having lived in many different countries, it's also exciting to work with such a globally diverse team. So, thank you again all, and I'm very eager to work with all of you and meet all of you soon in person. Thanks again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, and welcome. Our first substantive agenda item, as usual, is ALAC policy development. And I will turn over to Ms. Liang.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you, Mr. Greenberg. This is Ariel, for the record. And Happy New Year, everyone. So, for the public comments work, we're in pretty good shape. There are two statements that are in progress. One is the proposed renewal of [INAUDIBLE] registry agreement. And the [INAUDIBLE] already drafted a statement on that, and Alan and I have to do just a final chat before I can post it on the Wiki. So, I'm waiting for your response on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's actually on my list. I forgot about it.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. And then the second one that's in progress is on the identifying technology health indicators definition. Yrjö took the lead to draft a statement and Olivier provided a lot of useful comments, and I believe the first draft will be posted today or tomorrow, so Yrjö adopted these suggestions.

And then the public comments posted for that one is the 21st. So, we'll have a little bit of time for the large community to comment on these two. And then there's a new public comment just published. It's on the proposed charter amendments of the GNSO business contingency, and that public comment post date is December the 15th.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Has anyone had a chance to look at it? I looked at it very briefly. It is a rewrite, not a minor modification. And although I don't think there is anything there that is really substantive, it really should—someone should do a careful reading of it.

Among other things is how they have finessed what their current structure is with small and big business, which gives them, at the moment, two NomCom seats. So, do we have any volunteers of someone who is involved enough with the business constituency that they know who they were before and see how they're changing, or is it

just a really good rewrite of the rules, which every organization needs periodically?

Any volunteers? Anyone suggest someone from the rest of our organization who might be a good person to buttonhole for it? Past or present GNSO liaisons interested? Cheryl, your hand is up. And we can't hear you yet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Glad I wasn't swearing and mumbling under my breath before, because I must have been unmuted. I'm not saying that I think we necessarily need to do something, but I'm perfectly happy to take a look at it, and we might also then look at some of our people being mentored about the place, formally and informally, I suppose, to see whether this is something, if we are going to do something, that we might get them to hold a pen on as well.

So, if you want to leave that with me, me and probably Maureen, because I think we have probably closer links with various forms of menteeing, informal and formal. So, we'll see what we can do.

ALAN GREENBERG: I sense an action item coming on. Thank you, Cheryl. I don't think we're likely to comment on it, either, but I think we do need to do our due diligence and make sure that there is nothing there that we think is onerous. There are some groups within the GNSO that I think we would look more carefully at, but I think we need—do need to at least look at it. Thank you. Anything else, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. Nothing else, but just a quick explanation of the [INAUDIBLE] 200-300 notifications of a change to the At-Large Policy Development Wiki work space is because I was doing some overhaul, or restructuring of that space to make things a little more automated. So, apologies for sending you that.

ALAN GREENBERG: A week or two ago, yes, I did notice those. But luckily, I—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just thought you wanted to make sure we knew you were working over the holidays.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right? I interpreted it a different way. Since she made literally dozens of, perhaps hundreds of changes in a period of a minute or two, I thought she was just trying to impress us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Letter by letter, word by word.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. The next item on our agenda has been suggested as something we don't normally, explicitly do, but has been suggested that we may want to spend a few minutes on. It's an experimental item. If we want it to continue, we will. Otherwise, I can be told that it's not a good idea.

We've got a short amount of time to give any of our liaisons who choose to have anything to report or bring to our attention to do so. You're not obliged to, if you don't have anything important to say, but we will go through the list first. Maureen, if you have anything?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Just a few things. We've set a date for a meeting with the ccNSO in Copenhagen, and I know that Gisella is already liaising with Bart over that. And I believe that the council has come to some agreement, Julie, over the issue they had in relation to that extended whatever it was, document that they were looking at with the SSAC, and that they were sending a letter out to—back to SSAC over that. And finally, there's—they've had—I believe they've had one volunteer for the position of the liaison with the ALAC. And the volunteer is actually [INAUDIBLE].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Oh, amazing. He is?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. So, I'm not quite sure. I mean they did sort of say that he had volunteered for this. But yeah, this has been on the table, a volunteer for this liaison for ALAC. And—

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, you're talking about liaison to the ALAC?

MAUREEN HILYARD: To the ALAC, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: To be a liaison person. Since Ron left, I might actually be doing the report, ALAC reports, to the ccNSO. So, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: And with regard to a meeting, our meetings with the ccNSO have, over the years on occasion, been sort of boring, to put it mildly. The last one was so much fun I wouldn't consider not having them this time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a huge number of people with their hands up. Some of them are liaisons, some are not. Cheryl, is that a new hand, or is that your old one?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was a new hand. I just wanted to—

MAUREEN HILYARD: You're really underwater, mate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Glad I'm not. I just wanted to say that in regard to GNSO, what's happened since the last update is that we had our minutes from the last meeting, which I have not put up, and we have an agenda now being concerned for our next meeting. So, when that [INAUDIBLE] between meetings, point in time where documents are coming in, etcetera. That's about it from me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. With regard to the GNSO statement on the RDS review, I didn't put it on the agenda today because we really don't have time, but I am going to be called upon to speak on behalf of the ALAC and At-Large for what our position is. Is our position—are we convinced because of the—what was written, or do we stick by our position for an abbreviated review?

My personal position is I think everything they're suggesting there makes complete sense. I think a lot of it overlaps with the PDP, and I

think the rest—much of the rest of it is premature. That is, until the PDP gets some point where it's making close to recommendations, that I think the work is somewhat premature.

So, I would still like to see the abbreviated version. Given that this is GNSO territory, other groups may simply say "Sure, yeah, if that's what you want." But I would like input, and I will ask the ALAC again, but I'm asking this group specifically to provide input.

A lot of the initial comments seem to have forgotten the history of how we got here, and I think we need to do it in that context of the fact that this was an abbreviated review because of the reaction, and now we're trying to go in the other direction. So—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, just before Holly comes in, and I'm very keen to hear Holly, I think I agree with you, Alan. I think just a reminder comment as opposed to a deeply divisive one is probably worthwhile. There is a desire to clear stuff off the books in the GNSO, and I guess that's—this is a product of part of that. But that said, yeah, I think a little history lesson is probably worthwhile restating.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I mean from my perspective, I would have volunteered for the abbreviated form, because that would be a really short exercise. There's no way I'm going near this one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Another 15 years of everyone's life.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. Yrjö, please.

YRJO LANISPURO: Yeah, this is Yrjö Länsipuro, for the record. I got a question from the GAC, the secretariat, yesterday, about whether we would like to meet with them in Copenhagen and when, and also, whether we can have a call between the leadership of GAC and ALAC before Copenhagen.

And I said that this ALT meeting, I hope that we could decide on that. And of course, I would propose that we meet. We have one topic, which is the Council of Europe study, on the community TLDs that was actually presented in Hyderabad, and now everybody has probably reading it. I hope that it has been, or is in the process of being distributed to ALAC members as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's put that on the agenda for the discussion on the meeting, later on today. Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Alan. Julie Hammer speaking. Just to let you know that [INAUDIBLE] put out a report, SOC 90, just before Christmas, on the 22nd of December. It had quite an innocuous sounding name, just [INAUDIBLE] on the Stability of the Domain Name Space, but it's—

I guess it's repeating quite a number of messages that have been made many times in the past, in pointing out that multiple uses of the domain

names and the protocols beyond just the [INAUDIBLE] that leads to ambiguity and to name collisions, and reiterates the fact that the DNS is used not just for the sovereignty and the queries that's used for private networks and certain names are also used in alternative name spaces as well as geographic names, and also country code names.

So, the issue for the SSAC is trying to point out is that queries that do not resolve to a DNS name can potentially cause security and stability. There is no way that some of the existing names are ever going to be withdrawn, such as .co, .mail, .lan, but the SSAC is recommending that more coordination needs to happen between ICANN and other organizations, such as the IATS, in trying to come up with policy and means of coordinating names that are being used and potentially causing ambiguity.

So, the SSAC, in its recommendation, highlights that some of this coordination ought to happen prior to any new applicant by book for a second round of new gTLDs and recommending that some of the aspects ought to be addressing explicit policy. So, that will undoubtedly be briefed in the SSAC meeting virtually [INAUDIBLE] are currently looking at schedule between that in Copenhagen. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Julie. I'm less worried about it being highlighted with us than being highlighted with the GNSO, and particularly the PDP is looking at that. And I haven't heard that mentioned at all, and I'm not even sure what the mechanism for getting it mentioned.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, it's Cheryl. This has at least been mentioned on the plenary, because unfortunately there is a timing issue there, the plenary happened and the agenda happened without this discussion having happened. There's too many happenings in there.

But [INAUDIBLE] was certainly discussed in the leadership team, and its main provisions, for example, comes under the reigns of the work team [INAUDIBLE]. Certainly, my suggestion that trying to get a briefing from SSAC in a very public way, if not specifically to the GNSO, but for everyone interested in new gTLDs.

During Copenhagen might be a very wise thing indeed. So, there is an awareness. It's just not a high [INAUDIBLE] guided awareness yet, and I'm certain we'll continue to push the—we can't ignore this line. And I'm bold enough, not wearing my ALAC liaison to the GNSO hat, but simply my relatively high degree of confidence that ALAC would be very likely to support SSAC on this matter.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie speaking. I'll take that message back to the SSAC chair and suggest to him that he might want to think about ways of making this message much more public. I'm not sure—I'd be interested in your views to see whether it might even be something to be proposed as a hot topic. But

it would definitely be briefed in the SSAC public meeting. Sometimes because of the time that tends to be scheduled, the attendance of it is quite small, and often, the SSAC members in the meeting outnumber the non-SSAC members. So—

ALAN GREENBERG: I haven't got to one in ages.

JULIE HAMMER: I'll take that message back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Julie, I would suggest they consider, and I'm willing to let Cheryl tell me I'm wrong, but a briefing to the GNSO PDP on new gTLDs may well be warranted. Because most of these people are not going to pay any attention to it any other way.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. I'll take that message back. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, can I add one—

ALAN GREENBERG: One moment. You are in the queue. One other thing I'll point out is we do have an ALAC statement on record with regard to the fast paths for cc—for IDN ccTLDs, where we are in diametric opposition to what the

SSAC said. We may want to revisit that one day. Holly, if it's in response to this, quickly, and then we'll go on to Tijani.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Just a very brief thing. Julie, a couple of things. First of all, I know that subsequent procedures are stalled, but have you thought, with the ccRT, putting that in front of both Kylie and Carlton, because if we're talking about consumer trust, this sounds like something that impacts on consumer trust. Just a thought, but maybe they should publish it more widely, which is what you were suggesting.

JULIE HAMMER: You mean brief it more widely?

ALAN GREENBERG: To the review team.

JULIE HAMMER: Well, it's already published widely.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know, but I'm just asking for specific attention by Carlton and Kylie, who are on—well the ALAC members on the ccRT to say “Look. This is another piece of the puzzle we should actually be looking at.”

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, so I can—

[CROSSTALK]

HOLLY RAICHE: Who is the chair of the review team?

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathon—

JULIE HAMMER: This is the consumer trust you're talking about?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. What I might do is I might send it to Carlton and Kylie, who are the ALAC reps, and I'll suggest to Patrick that he should bring it to the attention of Jonathon [INAUDIBLE].

ALAN GREENBERG: Perfect.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. The subsequent features, I can certainly suggest that a briefing— can I just get the name of the chair of that, Cheryl?

[CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Jeff Newman and Avri, I think, is co-chairing that, if I'm not correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is correct. And I don't know what Holly means by stall. Cheryl here. I don't know what Holly means by stall, because we're having five meetings a week and the work is continuing.

HOLLY RAICHE: Our comments are stalled, not the work.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a different issue. That working group is moving a lot faster than the RDS one. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. Holly, [INAUDIBLE] to be GNSO liaison to ALAC, or was she asked and she accepted?

HOLLY RAICHE: Why are you asking me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I—

ALAN GREENBERG: He's really asking Maureen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: What do you mean?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry, can you repeat that? I had a visitor just pop in. Sorry, I was just away from the phone. Again please, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I asked if [INAUDIBLE] to be the GNSO liaison to ALAC or was she asked and she accepted?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'm unsure. I know that they had a call for volunteers since Ron left, and no one has come forward. And it's only just recently that she put her name forward, and probably because there was no one else available or making themselves available. I'm not quite sure.

TIJANA BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Because the information that I have is that she was solicited and she accepted. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's quite possible. It does raise some interesting issues, but we will not discuss them in a public meeting. Thank you all for those comments, and we'll go onto the next item, that is the At-Large review. I would like to present a chart that is new, but first, Holly and Cheryl.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, where we're up to right now is a pushback with time that has just been flagged by the ICANN staff, further. Alan, in response, has raised a question that is also in my mind, and that is they're looking for, they being ICANN's team, looking for another meeting.

I take a deep breath and say the expectations that were—that we all had about meeting with them was we'd be able to respond to something, and right up front in the meeting, it's just "We want to hear from you again." Well, I would want to set the expectations correctly as to if you want to meet with us, you've already heard—everybody's had an opportunity, everybody has been given an opportunity to make comments on the document, to have a further call about further—any further comment.

There will be an ALAC publicly available comment, and I'm not sure about the efficacy of yet another meeting unless it's actually a two-way meeting. So, Alan has rightly raised the question, what is this meeting for? And if it's just for more input, we've already had a lot of input. If it's for dialogue—

ALAN GREENBERG:

Holly, if I may interrupt. I think you're talking about an email that was only directed to you, me and Cheryl. The rest of the people don't have a clue what you're talking about.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay. There is an—at the moment, the schedule that has been—I have been giving everyone. Right now, there's been a question, could we

push that out further? Because a lot of comments have been made by ALAC in respect of the actual document.

That will mean that the public comment period will extend out. What the staff person who's managing this has suggested, or passed on from ICANN, is a request for another meeting during Copenhagen. And the question that I'm raising is what will the purpose of that meeting be?

Because we have all had an opportunity to comment. Now if it is open to the public, that may have a very different complexion on it, a different purpose on it, and we need to work through whether another meeting is necessary, the extent to which it's necessary, and the audience.

So, at the moment, we are in the midst of working through should we be meeting in Copenhagen with ICANN's team. And the question is the length. Can we fit a meeting in? Who should be invited? And what is the purpose of the meeting?

So, at this stage, I think we're certainly thinking those things through before we get back. But right now, they are working on all of the feedback that they have received by written comment on the document and from the call that we had on the 6th of January. And that's where we're up to.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Holly. To be clear, what they asked for—this was on a call with the ICANN staff responsible for the review and the review team, an extensive call they said. And ICANN's team had suggested that—just be

clear. They're going to come up with their new report on the 31st of January.

The intent is to start public comment immediately, even though we did ask for a period, a short period of time by which the review team could see it before it went public. We also asked for an opportunity to change it, but that was completely rejected.

That would mean the public comment would end on the 12th of March, right into the middle of the—or the start of the Copenhagen meeting. So, Lars is suggesting we extend the public comment to the next week. And I said I support that.

However, the items team is asking for us to have a meeting with the—presumably with the ALAC, or the ALAC and regional leaders, and they were asking for as much as a half a day. And I asked what is this for?

This would be right at the end of the public comment period, where we already would have formulated or would be formulating, finalizing in Copenhagen our comments, and a half-day discussion, I did not have any clue what they were proposing to discuss at that point other than to tell us the error of our ways and why their wisdom is better than ours, if that is indeed the case at that point.

So, I'm waiting for an answer back from that. I haven't seen one yet. But clearly, I don't think this is going all that well, but maybe I'm wrong. Anyone else have any comments? Cheryl, do you have anything to say regarding the review before we—if you could put the presentation up in the box just to be ready for when Cheryl's finished?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm Cheryl. Just go on with your presentation, because I think that's more important now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Is everyone on this call, were you all on the work party discussion where I presented the length of terms of ALAC and At-Large leaders? Is there anyone who didn't see that? Okay. Let's assume everyone saw it. Most of the presentation is the same.

There is one new chart, however. And if we could scroll through it pretty quickly to the most complex chart, you'll recognize it when you get to it. That's the one. Okay. If you go back to the previous one first. No, that's the one. That was the composite one of all people who have been involved as volunteers in At-Large, that is in terms of ALAC, regional leaders, NomCom, or liaisons, and in alphabetical order by last name, and the period of time that they served in each capacity.

Next slide. Same data, but sorted first by RALO and then by the date of their first meeting. And it's a chart that essentially shows that yes, there are some people, once they start, don't stop. I'm one of them. Cheryl's another one. There may be gaps in the service, but they stick around.

There are also lots of people who don't. If you look at LACRALO, which is the—it doesn't all show on this screen, but is the fourth one down, you'll see the length of the terms are a little bit shorter, but that's because of their ALAC term service, ALAC restriction to only one term.

So, this demonstrates that yes, some people do stay around a long time, and occasionally there's someone who stays around too long, but I think it does demonstrate that there is turnover. And what it doesn't show,

and of course what we can't show, are the people who never entered the system, nominally because we weren't providing opportunities.

I would be interested in, not in a public document, but I'd be interested in hearing from each of the people here, and identifying how many people are there that showed real promise but they disappeared because we didn't let them in, we didn't let them in to one of the privileged positions.

I can't think of many. Certainly, when I think of NARALO, there are not a lot of those people. But I'd be interested in knowing, are there in fact people that we think left the group because of—left At-Large and we lost them because we never gave them a travel position?

So, we don't have the time for this right now, but I would really be interested. Can you come up with many names? I'm not sure there are a lot. And certainly, if you look at some of the RALOs, where we have trouble recruiting for ALAC positions, nobody is volunteering.

So, interesting question. If you have any input, let's talk privately. That's all I have. Any further issues on the review? Olivier, go ahead. And I haven't heard anyone saying don't send this to them, so I will be.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I just wanted to comment. I'm not going to repeat the things 100 times of what we've all been saying before. I just have concerns about the attitude of the reviewers that seem to be taking this line that whatever we're saying now, they're not going to change their mind, or at least we've heard that a few times.

I thought that the rules of the game were completely different to this. So, I'm not really quite sure what to make of this. But one thing I wanted to point out though, we've been in kind of a reply mode so far, very defensive position on things, and I wonder whether there isn't any chance to be on the—

I wouldn't call it the offensive position, but certainly on a position where we would make our own recommendations as to what we think needs to be improved with our point of view. I don't know whether that is possible, and I'd be interested in hearing feedback here. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. I certainly have. They're embedded in my comments and in the discussions I've had with them, that I don't think we can scrap ALSs conceptually right now, which is logically what they're suggesting, even though they're saying yes, we could technically keep them. And I think we have to do a much better job of trying to find people who are interested in what we do. And I think that is really our only opening on the short term. Holly, and then Tijani.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Could I remind everybody that this is just the beginning of a process, that this goes to the board? The board can accept the report or not, but ultimately it comes back to us, and we're the ones who are actually going to be in control of implementing it.

So, this is not the end. This is the beginning of a long process. And what we have to do is work through, take on board whatever criticisms there are, make notes about what's legitimate, what we don't agree with,

why, how we can address things. And it's going to be a long process, but ICANN is not the last word. We are.

So, I'm going to need all the support I can, and Olivier, I would expect you and Cheryl, and everybody else, to say "We can make it better. We're not necessarily accepting what ICANN says, at least in part, or we don't think that their recommendations are going to address things, but we can come up with our own solutions." So, let's not despair. Let's actually—it's a call to arms for us really.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Holly, their question really is what do we put as the odds that the review team makes recommendations we don't agree with and ultimately the board accepts them despite our disagreements? That's the question that we have to put our goggles on for, to try to look at that. I'm not asking for an answer today, but that's what it comes down to.

HOLLY RAICHE:

And it comes down to what ALAC—

ALAN GREENBERG:

Are things likely to be imposed on us that we don't want?

HOLLY RAICHE:

And I think it makes a very strong case. We basically have to have a very good mission. In fact, I was going to raise, we have to actually write a very good response to the public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. Olivier, we will need to make a point of position, or let's say a point of proposals. We will need to do that, but I don't think it is now that we have to do that. First of all, we'll see what will be the report that will be put forward from the committee.

It will be the starting point for our future work that we have to do, and I think that we have a lot of work to do. First of all, with the board members, second to prepare what our [INAUDIBLE] the improvement of the At-Large, other than destroying everything.

And third, we have also to be cautious, because [INAUDIBLE], there is a lot of problems and we have people who say more or less what this item team is saying now. So, we need to work on several types, but I don't think that now we can start doing anything. It must be done, in my point of view, just after the release of the final report that will be for public comments. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Anyone else before we go on?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi, if I may.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead. Oh, Heidi, sorry. I didn't see your hand. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I'm looking at the slide that the SI team prepared on the next steps, basically. If you could just allow me just a few sentences that I think will clarify things?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So, the first is that on submission of the items report, the At-Large working party will assess the recommendations, endorse some proposed amendments and may recommend that others are not implemented. That deadline is June/July 2017.

Then the working party assessment, together with the unedited final report, will then be passed to the organizational effectiveness committee of the board. They will consider both and then decide which recommendations to accept or reject.

And again, that's September/October. And their role basically is just to make sure that the review process is followed and that the outcome meets the quality expectations. Then the OEC's decision will be passed to the full board, where it will be voted on, and that is October/November. Okay?

So, there's a lot of different options. And then the board can then adopt the final report recommendations, all working party assessment

recommendations, or a mix of both. And then it's handed back to the At-Large committee for implementation.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Heidi. I think the real question, in my mind, is to what extent, following—remember, after the public comment, they get to revise the report and issue a final one. I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that large parts of the community outside of At-Large, if they reproduce the exact report that is there today, making no changes, there are vast parts of the community who would say “Yeah, yeah.”

Because there are lots of—there's both motivated people to attack us, and there are people who are misdirected. Just look at the number of staff members who said things that were passively incorrect, but they believed. So, I'm not quite as optimistic as you are that the next steps will fix all the issues, but we have no choice but to go through them. Tijani, one last comment and then we'll go on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, exactly. And I agree with you, Alan. I don't see the board members refusing the recommendation of ICANN if the community says yes. It would be very difficult for them, especially now, with the new accountability mechanisms. So, I am really not optimistic at all.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It will also be difficult for them to do something against the views of the organization being—that is affected. It won't be the first time, but we

don't know how this new world will work. Next item, BCEC and BMSBC.
Who is first, Julie or Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Tijani. Oh, I seem to have an echo. Yes, it's probably, from our perspective, we've finished the bulk of our work except for our review. As you know, we released the BCEC candidates on the 16th of December, and I think we've actually met since then.

We're currently doing a fairly detailed review of our processes and our support tools, and will be putting out a fairly substantial report with a number of recommendations. And we're doing our very best to set up a legacy that will make the next BCEC slot in three years' time much, much easier, so that they can capitalize on a lot of the work that we did.

At the moment, all of the activity is with Tijani, with the RALOs, and I'm participating, to a small extent, in that process simply to brief them on what the BCEC has done and if there are any questions. But we'll be—those meetings will be completed by the end of next week, and then I see that it's primarily up to Tijani. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Julie. Of course, all of your work presupposes that your work will not be taken over by the NomCom in a random selection (he says tongue in cheek). Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. Our next steps are the following: tomorrow we will have a single-purpose call with the RALO leaders to speak about the petition, to add in other candidates on the slate, and to explain, if they have time of course.

Normally the main issue on this call will be the petition and how that we've got the support of the other RALOs on these items. If we have time tomorrow, we will also speak with them about the suitable ways of interaction with the candidates. How do they see this?

So, that we have information. And when the final slate will be issued, we'll interact with the candidates and so on, ask them about their best way to interact with the community. And at the end, we will compile all this, and we will do everything that they want so that everyone will be happy for the interaction.

It is very important that they are happy with the interaction length, the interaction process, so that they know that they had any opportunity to explain their views, their revisions, and for the community also to ask all questions they want to ask so that they work according to the response of the candidates.

So, this is the purpose of tomorrow. It would be a single purpose normally, but if it is very easy and everyone knows everything, and we don't need any more information, we will speak with them about the interaction for a time. So, this is the first step.

After that, you have two deadlines. The first one is the deadline for the RALOs to submit petitions, which is 19 of January, and the second one is

the 29 of January, and this is a deadline for the other RALOs to support the petition. I suspect, and it is only this, that by 19 of January, we will know that there will not be any additions.

So, we will wait 10 days in the process. We will do the full interaction. This time we have decided to make the interactions the most—how do you say—the best we can do. So, these are the next steps. If you have any questions about anything, I am here to answer. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I see Julie has her hand up.

JULIE HAMMER:

Yes, thanks Alan. Julie speaking. I guess I'm just responding to something that Tijani said that the main purpose of the call with the RALOs is to explain the petition process, if there's time, then the call will move onto discussing engagement with the candidates and so on.

I've been a little bit surprised, I have to confess, at the amount of emphasis that's been put on this petition process, because I would have hoped that it would be very, very much the exception rather than the rule.

Perhaps I'm reacting incorrectly here, but it's almost as if the RALOs are being encouraged to petition, and that's sort of saying, well the BCEC may not have done their work properly. So, I guess I'm just really saying I'm a little bit surprised at how much emphasis is being put on the petition rather than the engagement with the selected candidates by the BCEC. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Julie. I see we have some hands up. I have one comment to make, but I'll wait until other people speak. Cheryl and then Tijani.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl here. And thank you for saying that, Julie, because that's something that's been deeply concerning me, listening to reports of what is said to RALO meetings to date. I keep saying "Optional petition process." "Optional petition process."

The optional petition process is basically there in case the community at large think we have done an awful job. And I find it a little concerning if there is indeed emphasis being put on it as opposed to a passing awareness. "You do know it is in the rules, if you wholeheartedly disagree with the expertise and professionalism of the outcome by a group of people you've selected, who go deeply into these candidates and the criteria and the criteria matching, then you have this as an out." But if it's done the other way, [INAUDIBLE] going to be really unimpressed. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, everyone. This is not at all encouraging RALOs to petition, at all. But it is to explain and to make them—because you know, people don't read. And at the end, they may not be aware of the

process of the petition. So, perhaps a RALO will make a petition, and no one thinks to support it, and at the end, the petition is not accepted.

So, we have to explain to them that any petition cannot be accepted if there is not at least two other RALOs to support it. This single-purpose call is on the timeline from the first day, and everyone accepted the timeline.

So, it is not complaint that you are creating now, or we try to add now, or we try to make the decision of the BCEC contested at all. We are only applying the rules, and we try to explain to people how to do what is the procedure for everything. I repeat that this single-purpose call is on the timeline from the first day. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Any further comments? I have one request other than that. I notice an X from Cheryl. I would request that staff be prepared, since any action of the RALOs, either to petition or to support a petition, must be by formal action of the RALOs, which implies a vote.

I would as if staff be prepared on a moment's notice to institute such a vote in any of the RALOs. We do not have the time and the process to spend three days gathering the names and everything, and getting ready to start a vote. I'm not predicting there will be one, but if there are, we don't want staff to be the impediment of that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

And this is a thing—this is one of the things that we want to stress during the single-purpose call.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I know. But I'm stressing it to staff, that we need to be prepared should any RALO decide to go through that process. Any further comments before we go onto the next item? We are way behind time right now. Then we'll go onto the Fiscal Year '18 budget requests, and there is a short document, which identifies the ALAC budget requests for the last year, and the outcomes, or sort of the outcomes, and ones that have been mentioned in various forms for the new process.

I'm going to turn it over to Heidi, but if we could give control to us so we can blow it up a little bit. If we could have control over the central pod? Well, we will get control over the central pod later. Of the items that—I'm just going to go over the last year's ones, and turn it over to Heidi.

And we do have an echo. The LACRALO transition, to fix the LACRALO translation software was funded and was approved. I note that a year later, it's still not done. And although we have said we don't have to put the request in again, I'm starting to get very impatient.

RALO funding for local engagement has been turned over to—we were told the GSE has a fund. Heidi will talk about whether we put that one in again. The ALAC development session was funded, although we didn't do a lot with it, and we are now suggesting we use it for the Copenhagen meeting.

Liaison travel slots, the answer said yes, it's already in place, but the words said no you can't do it. So, we still haven't resolved that, and the strategy session was indeed a success. And Heidi will tell us, I think, that the—I'm sorry, the development session was funded and we did it, and

the strategy session is the one that we're going to look at revising. Heidi, if I can turn it over to you now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you very much. So, I'm going to just—Alan, I missed just the last few minutes. So, I'm going to read the message that I sent to you that follows a discussion I had with Rob if that's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So, I'm just going to read some of the key points here for some of the proposals. For the GAC liaison, the suggestion is that the ALAC submit both a Fiscal Year '18 additional budget request for this, noting within the request that this position should be covered to the core budget, and that then ALAC submits its comments on the Fiscal Year '18 budget but you also request it as well.

Okay? On the ALAC and RALO development sessions, no need to submit a fiscal year request. They should be added into core. Okay? They are very successful and I stressed that to them hoping that they'll continue both RALO and the ALAC one.

ALAC strategy sessions. Okay, that's something that you wished me to decide what you want to do with that. Because again, that whole idea of that was before the new meeting strategy allowed that first day. So, that's something you need to think about.

The captioning programs. Submit again, the request for one more year. It will help to do that. There is an option of it going into core. GSE funding for RALO activities. Please submit that again, because again, because of the slight delay in getting that going with the template that now has been put up/posted, the project really hasn't started yet, so we need to submit that one again for next year.

The IGF funding for At-Large coordinated activities. If you develop a strong Fiscal Year '18 request, as well as add that to the Fiscal Year '18 core budget statement for that activity. APRALO GA. Submit Fiscal Year '18 additional budget request for that.

And if I could start working with the APRALO team as well as Gisella and maybe Suzie on getting the approximate budget costs, if you could just let us know the broad framework of what you're looking at for that GA, within reason. And then the LACRALO mailing list, no need for Fiscal Year '18 additional budget request.

And then—sorry, two more. NARALO summer school—not summer school, internet school, along the sidelines of the Puerto Rico meeting in NARALO, it might be a good idea to submit a strong proposal for that, and I know that it's happening, that is being developed.

And then the tribal—NARALO Tribal Ambassadorship, and then yes, if we could submit for Fiscal Year '18 additional budget request for an enhanced project, which I have in my inbox already. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. On the last two items, why are those ALAC issues? Why are those not going to be settled by the RALO?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, these are all—I just combined everything, RALO and the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I think what we're talking about here is ALAC submissions.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Specifically, the—I carefully put the APRALO GA as an ALAC request. Yes, the APRALO is going to have to provide most of the content of it, but this is now part of an ALAC strategy that has been accepted, and I believe it's an ALAC request, not an APRALO request.

I think the difference is substantive, and we need to make sure that's done properly. On the captioning, again, is that an ALAC request or a NARALO request? In the past, it has been a NARALO request? Do we want to keep it that way or do we want to take it on in saying now this is an ALAC? I'm asking for input from the rest of the community, rest of the group. I'm not sure which way to go. A quick vote, León?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. I would support having this remain NARALO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I would support that too. Anyone disagree?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, this is Heidi. I believe, and I'm going to double check as soon as I can, but even though Judith did propose that, it went under the ALAC. Let me just look at that in the Fiscal Year '17.

ALAN GREENBERG: If it was done, then we have no issue at all. If it wasn't done, which should it be this year? Okay. Just a reminder, we do need clarity on the liaison travel slots, or we will put it in again. They can't get away with saying yes in the summary answer and no in the text. RALO funding of local engagement. You said we should put that one in again. We were told there was \$10,000 of GSE funding. Do we believe it might go away this fiscal year? Is that the issue?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, this is Heidi. Again, that \$10,000 was for Fiscal Year '17. So yes, it needs to go and have another request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Even though the request was refused because there was GSE funding?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, the request was approved, and the—

ALAN GREENBERG: No, the request was refused, and we were told there was GSE—other GSE money that could be used. I believe.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Well, I think it said yes, but no. Let me just double check.

ALAN GREENBERG: The message I got was—sorry. The message I got was “Through other paths, GSE had already requested this and it was approved.” So, I have misread that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, so my understanding is that because of that request last year, Fiscal Year '17, that a bunch of funding was added to the GSE budget. And again, that's why there's a need to do that again for this next fiscal year.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. ALAC IGF. That is a proposal that outreach and engagement is talking about to increase the ALAC visibility and presence at IGFs. I first heard about that today. I think what they're requesting right now is a bit aggressive, asking for five travel slots.

And the focus is still too much on outreach. So, of those of you who are involved in the outreach and engagement, you may want to look at that

proposal and help refine it. I really think this is a multi-year effort we're looking at, and I think what we're looking at right now is to just get ICANN proper to admit that At-Large has a place at the IGF.

It's not only board and staff that represent ICANN. And what NCUC did is a good part of the rationale for that, but I think we, if we're too aggressive, I think we're going to get it refused altogether. Olivier, I see your hand up. I'll go to you in a minute.

On the strategy session, you'll recall that we did put in something called the ALAC strategy session. That was when we were trying to get Saturday funded, and we came up with the name strategy session because in ICANN, to get something approved, you have to have a fancy name on it.

We couldn't just say we want to work on Saturday. And that's, it's never been a particular thing we did, and now with the new meeting strategy, that day is there anyway, or it's not there. We have no—we don't have any option of asking for an extra day.

I would suggest that we repurpose this in what we are trying to do on a regular basis, and that is have the ALT meet for a debriefing and strategy session after the ICANN meeting, and that we've put it in as a regular request instead of doing it on an ad-hoc basis each meeting, like we're doing right now. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Two questions. The first one is to do with what was just mentioned regarding funding that went into the Global Stakeholder Engagement, the \$10,000

that went into Global Stakeholder Engagement this year. Has the ALAC or At-Large benefited from this?

Because we had asked. And the feedback that I had received was that, in some regions apparently said “Yeah, this can be used,” and others were just told “No, this is not for you.” So, I don’t know. Some clarification needs to be made on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, so again, this is a request for the RALOs, not necessarily the ALAC. That’s number one. And number two is that in Hyderabad, during the discussion with the GSE, it was agreed that the process for the RALO requests, was agreed. And now there’s a template that has been posted. So, if you could put that into the chat. And basically, get in touch with Chris Mendini if you’re needing that, and the process can begin.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, you’re essentially saying that the money was allocated last year, but there was no process by which to use it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: There was no clear process. We had a discussion, but there was a question raised in Hyderabad, and during Hyderabad there was a template sent out. And we basically have agreed that just go ahead and

use that template. It's a work in progress. If we see a need for improvements to that template, we can go ahead and use it. But I think you can start putting in requests.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Yeah. And thanks for this, Heidi. So, that's great. That was the first question, and I'm glad I've got an answer on that. That's good. And so, perhaps we should let our RALOs know that they may start submitting requests for this.

They have until June, until the end of this fiscal year. So, it would be a real pity to let this go to waste, especially since it's something that we have asked for. The second question was I noticed here a request for an APRALO general assembly.

And I was under the impression that the board had voted that the rotation of general assemblies and At-Large summits was going to go into the core budget. So, I'm not quite sure why there is now a request here for extra budget for APRALO GA.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good wording. I'm not sure either.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, that was what we put in, Rob advised. And if you'll recall, that for the Fiscal Year '17, the request for both the GAs happening this year

were requested through Fiscal Year additional requests. But let me ask Rob that question. I'll get back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, at the time we put those in, it wasn't part of the core budget. We have an interesting situation. We've been told that yes, it is part of the core budget, but of course it's always subject to availability of funds should there be some sort of disaster.

And I don't know of a mechanism that the ALAC has to say "This year we plan to use that money from the core funds as opposed to another year we might not." So, we're in never-never land. We've never—no one's ever had this kind of process before.

So, I'm suspecting we use the special budget request process to say we want to draw on this money that is part of the—has been agreed is part of the core funds. I'm not quite sure how to word that, but I think that's what we're talking about. And Heidi, you might want to talk to Rob about that. Tijani?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. I do agree with you. I don't think it is the right way to do it. If it is now in the core budget of ICANN, ALAC should give to ICANN, to the board, the program that we project, how we see. We gave them the general program.

Now we have to give them the staff, give them the staff, general assembly of APRALO. Here is will be this, it will be this. This is, in my point of view, the way that ICANN staff programming, our general assemblies and our summits in the core budget of ICANN. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It's quite clear that when we come to a summit, there's no way that the dollar number will fit into special budget requests. So, I don't think this is a special budget request. I think it is that we're just using that opportunity to remind them that they have a core budget. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. Old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Alright, does everyone agree that we do the ALT strategy sessions, that is the morning after the ICANN meeting, which implies some travel funding, it implies funding for a room, and possibly breakfast? Breakfast depends on the hour. So, if it starts late enough, we don't have to provide breakfast.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm away from my computer, Alan, but yes from Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I see several tick marks. I hear no "nos." We have our marching orders. Thank you. Anything else on budget issues? Last call. If

there's anything that you believe ALAC should be submitting something on that is not on that list, then we need to hear about it quickly, very quickly.

The budget requests are due in five days. We are now—I've lost track. When did this meeting start? I think it started 45 minutes ago. We have 45 minutes to go. We're about on time at this point, I think. Is that correct? Can someone confirm?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It actually started over an hour ago.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah.

[CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me bring up my calendar.

HEIDI ULLRICH: 18 minutes to go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we have 18 minutes to go and an hours' worth of discussion to be held. Alright. We are somewhat behind. Next item is At-Large—let's go over. Are there any issues that we need to cover today, and can people—we have another meeting scheduled immediately after this, unfortunately.

Let's try to do them in order, but we do have to at least spend a minute or two on every single one of the items that we have here. So, turn it over to Gisella, or whoever's doing the scheduling. I will say that I have asked León whether he will continue in his role of trying to be the mastermind of the scheduling.

You may recall for the last meeting, León was somewhat preoccupied with other things and couldn't put as much time into it as one would have hoped. He has agreed to do it this time, with a commitment of putting the time in, so I am very grateful for that. Thank you, León. And I will now turn it over to Gisella and León.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. Gisella here. For the call, we have straight after this is to actually run through the outlines of the draft. We have to—staff have got a quality workshop the week of the 23rd of January. I ideally need to have this schedule set, confirmed by the end of next week.

So, it's going to be a lot of work and possibly a few emails, maybe a call if need be, over the next few days. Sorry, next week. The block schedule is not yet set in stone. There have been a few emails today, which Alan will probably have seen. I haven't seen any changes as of yet.

And you can see the block schedules here on the Adobe Connect. And now we're just going to have to fill the gaps. Again, a major issue we had in Hyderabad were all the conflicting meetings. That is also due to the fact that there were so many last-minute changes.

So, I'm going to do my best, as soon as I can see people's meetings coming up, to be able to notify everyone, put it on our master

spreadsheet and make sure that everyone on the ALT is aware of what's happening. What we're going to be finalizing also, which groups we want to meet with, and the rest I'll hand over to Heidi. And there will be more—

ALAN GREENBERG: Before you do, can someone explain to me what day one and day two sessions are? Board committees outreach and board committee's newcomer's day. Are we all being invited to the board committees now?

GISELLA GRUBER: No, they generally put—those are days for general sessions. I've been looking at the index at the bottom of this as well. But I unfortunately wasn't on the last call, and I think Heidi said she'll follow up on those, the board committee outreach. My understanding is that it is to join the various groups, their meetings as well. That is how it was in Marrakesh.

ALAN GREENBERG: So again, we think Saturday and Sunday we have to schedule our own sessions within ourselves? Perhaps some of them might be of interest to other people.

GISELLA GRUBER: Absolutely. And I'm also—sorry, I'm also just going to find out what the networking activities are on the—in the evenings. Because that looks similar to what we had at the policy forum in Helsinki, when the

evenings we had cocktails where everyone could meet and mingle, which was quite a good format.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Are we going to send out—do we want to send out something to the ALAC and regional leaders for who they want to meet with, or simply make decisions on their behalf? I'm looking for input. León?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. This is León. I would suggest that we do a call for meetings that might be of interest to the community, of course, but that we manage to establish a deadline for this. And we will discuss this in our next call for scheduling. But we should set a very tight deadline so that we have enough time for planning. So yes, I would support asking for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, it's just a question, and it's something I raised with León just briefly. We used to have—managed to have an hour or two at a meeting where we actually talked to ourselves about a policy issue, and certainly Whois is one, new gTLDs is another.

But just to bring ourselves up and talk to each other about our own policy positions. And I just wondered, can we reinstate that? Either that—and my other complaint is so often we are so tied up, we miss a

lot of really interesting meetings that are not ALAC meetings but that would be really useful.

And Julie hinted at it, the SSAC meeting. We never get to—I never get to go. Can we stand back and rethink what we can do that is productive that balances our own processes with actually talking to each other about policy and being able to participate in some of the other activities that are going on? Just as a thought. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We do regularly—last meeting was an exception. It was a weird meeting. In general, we have plenty of sessions that are not assigned to people. How well people use them is a different issue. It's pretty hard to guarantee we're freeing up a certain session when we don't know when that session is being held until the last moment.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yes, that's true.

ALAN GREENBERG:

So, we do have that problem. In terms of us allocating time for policy, we do, if someone puts it on the agenda, then we get to talk about it. You will recall there was an RDS session in Hyderabad which we cancelled because there was no content. So...

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I'm happy to do two things. I'm happy to do the capacity stuff again, and I'm happy to actually do a one or two-hour thing, and just bring in speakers.

ALAN GREENBERG: This falls under the category of another item we'll talk about in a minute.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't have the time today to talk about detail sessions one by one. But we need to get the process going. So, we do have an action item to send out a survey. It's not on the action item list, but it will be, right? Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else? Gisella? León?

LEON SANCHEZ: Not on my side, Alan. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, that's an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, anything further?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, no. There will be more [INAUDIBLE]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. SSRT selections. I'm just asking for someone else to review the emails. There were about 20—

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, sorry, Alan. It's Gisella. Just a quick call. Are we going to discuss the meeting, whether we want to meet with the registries and the CSGs? Because we had two meeting with them in Hyderabad only with the ALT. So, I'm wondering if that is of interest as well. And if there are any groups that the ALT wants to meet with specifically. I know we're going to discuss this after, but does anyone have any?

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's make contact with them. In both cases, they explicitly said just the leadership team. So, we need to find out if they are indeed interested in continuing those discussions or not, and at what level. So, if you could reach out to their staff support people, please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Will do. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or to whoever it is that makes such decisions. I think we'll be flexible at this point. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I thought that we were only dealing with [INAUDIBLE] so far. I was working to reach AC on their agenda, outreach and engagement. Can I just briefly discuss this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Then go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks, Alan. As you will notice on day one, the whole day has outreach written on it. Well, you used to be able to see it, but now we're back on the agenda. But if we were on that sheet, you would find out that day one has outreach all across the day.

It's really up to us, I think, with my own interpretation, it's up to us to decide what we want to do for outreach. And there was a call with the outreach and engagement working group a bit earlier today. As chair of EURALO, and co-chair of the outreach and engagement working group, I'm trying to federate all the efforts from everyone.

Because in previous times, there were so many different efforts that were done by so many different people independently, that sometimes we'd end up with things that were not constructive or things that were clashing with each other.

So, on the one hand, we have Global Stakeholder Engagement, [INAUDIBLE], who is on board to help with any—well basically, any coordination on things that ICANN might wish to do outside the actual venue. At present, of course this would need the help of the local host.

And there's work going on, and hopefully within the next few days, perhaps week, we'll get a little more information about this, whether it would be a possibility to go out there and meet with some universities. And if you do have, by the way, some local contacts in Denmark in universities, then please get in touch with me, and perhaps we can help out with that.

I know [INAUDIBLE] has been helping, but there are others who might be able to help on that. But secondly, we might wish to move forward with a capacity-building program that we've had in the past that's been very helpful. And again, unfortunately Tijani was not on the call today earlier.

I'm not quite sure whether he was invited or not, but it would be good to have the help of the capacity-building working group to be able to have a program of capacity-building, not only on day one but perhaps sprinkled throughout the week.

That's to discuss with Tijani and his group and find out what the best options on that. Thirdly, we have had—I've contacted, upon the insistence and request of the members of the outreach and engagement working group, I've contacted the NCUC, who've always been very proactive in doing things.

And we've basically come down to an agreement that we're going to work together on this, because there's just so much to do. So, today we had [INAUDIBLE], who was on the call, who leads the capacity-building efforts of NCUC, and they have—currently we're in some discussions with them to see what we can do together.

And they would probably also join up the civil society incentive, etcetera, that we have. [INAUDIBLE] is working, by the way, with Adam Peak also on the civil society thing. And we're also working together on a European engagement session, European stakeholder's engagement session, which would link up with any EURALO.

It's not going to be a showcase, but it would be some kind of a EURALO cocktail, European cocktail, a little bit along the lines of what we had in Dublin, where there was a discussion that took place first in the room, and a little debate about issues and things, and then afterwards, we went outside and had a drink together and a few canapes. So, that's the current status, and that's it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have several hands up. We have a good 20 minutes of things to do after this, and we're just about out of time. Yrjö?

YRJO LANISPURO: Yeah, still on Copenhagen, on point 8-B. I would like to give some sort of answer for the GAC. They indicate that they would like to meet with us, and I would very much like to tell them that yes, we would like to meet with you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the answer is we would be delighted to meet, either leadership or the GAC as a whole. I don't think we have any particular topics on my hot list. Maybe you do. So yes, we are certainly agreeable, if we can come up with—we need to decide on their call whether it's leadership or the whole group, and what the major issues are. I would like to continue the meeting at one level or another, just to maintain momentum.

YRJO LANISPURO: Okay, thank you. Understood.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?
[INAUDIBLE]

HOLLY RAICHE: Gisella, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Just with regards to the logistics on that, because we're having a call after this. Will you be responding to Tom, and also just seeing if it will be the ALT or the whole ALAC? In the past, it has been the entire ALAC. Will you be following up on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's varied from meeting to meeting, and yes, he will.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a thing. I actually got together full sessions for capacity-building in Hyderabad. It went really well, and with very little effort I can simply change those slides and again do the same session. I could do it in a couple of hours or whatever, or spread out over a full day. But the material's already done and it worked.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. What material are you talking about?

HOLLY RAICHE: What I did in Hyderabad was four successive lunch hours, gave a presentation, basically capacity-building about ICANN, about ALAC and about policy, to about 20-25 people. And that went really well. Now I'm happy to do that. If we are wondering what—Olivier's wondering what to put in the outreach activities. If we want to get a bunch of people and talk to them about ICANN, I've got the slides.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, you were responding to Olivier. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I am. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further thing on ICANN58? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing. Item number nine, SSR review. The consensus call ended yesterday at midnight UTC. My reading of the emails was Sebastian was the only person who objected and said he does not support it.

I would like somebody else, either a staff member or one of the ALT or a liaison, to review all of the emails that went out on the ALAC—I believe it was the ALAC internal list, but I'm not sure, and confirm that before I announce the results. Technically, a consensus call passes if there is at least 80 percent. That means we need three people dissenting.

Since we only have 14, the number is 11.2. Anyway, two or three dissenting is enough to kill a consensus. I'd have to check which it is. At this point, I believe there is only one. I would like a volunteer to, in the next 12 hours or so, and that can be flexible on that number, confirm that is either correct, there were no other objections.

I know people like Seun made a lot of comments, but I don't believe they objected. Can I have someone who will get back to me on that? We need a second pair of eyes. I can't double check my own reading of it. Then I'll assign it. Heidi, can you please either do it or make sure someone on staff does that?

If there's anything that you think is an objection from someone else, call my attention to it so I can make a judgement call. Thank you. Next item. The ALAC selection appointee committee. The issue was raised, again by Sebastian, as to what the charge is of that committee.

I would like to work with one other person, one other ALAC ALT member, who is on the selection committee, to draw up a mission statement. Are there any volunteers among those five—four other people? The pattern we have been following is exactly the one that was used by Oliver's selection committee before, and my intention is to continue doing that. Tijani, is that volunteering?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No, it is to say that perhaps we need a charter more than a mission statement, and it can be very simple and very clear. I can work with you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm using the term mission as a short statement of what it does without the other stuff that has become part of ICANN charters with CCWGs and things like that. So, I think we're talking the same language. We may be using different words. León, is that a new hand? León, is that a hand to volunteer?

Actually, León and I can draft something. An action item for León and me to draft something for review of the ALT and the ALAC. Thank you very much. Workload—the next item. Workload and enlarging cracks into which things fall. We are in a situation where increasingly things are not getting done.

Some of them are—they fall through my cracks. Some fall through staff's cracks. Some fall through other people's cracks. Our action item methodology is just not delivering right now. I welcome input, again from staff or people in this group, on how we can do better.

Examples are the work we said we were going to do on publishing metrics. Right now, it's in my hands, and I recognize that, but it took a long time to get done. We have a CCWG—I'm sorry, we have the working group on new gTLDs, which we've appointed chairs to, co-chairs, but we haven't done a call for membership, or a call to meeting or anything like that.

There's just a continual stream of things that we say we're going to do but never happen. So, I'm not—we don't have the time to brainstorm on this meeting, but we're going to have to do something better than what we're doing right now, because too many things are falling through the cracks. And it's not a single person's cracks. It seems to be

spread all around. Staff announcements. Heidi, you have an item on the agenda.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to let everyone know that starting the week of the 23rd, all policy staff will be at their annual workshop in Los Angeles. So, while we can still support a very minimal amount of calls, we just ask that you are aware of that and that we will be busy from the early morning until the late evening.

And then in addition, I will be at meetings starting this next Thursday, not tomorrow, but the one week, all the way through the weekend as well. And then the week following that, the week of the 30th, Sylvia and I and Alan will be at the LACRALO assembly in Los Angeles. So, just for all of you to be aware of all that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Is León there as well?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Of course, León. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Can you arrange for the policy workshop to get all the MSSl people and all the GNSO people alerted too so we don't have any working groups and we can have a vacation?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well I do know that DPRD is holding a workshop as well, so at least you'll have that.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I haven't heard of any meetings being cancelled because of that. Sadly. Alright. Lastly, we have a vacancy in the EURALO seat because Veronica [INAUDIBLE] has resigned. Olivier, can you give us a very brief update of what your expectations are of refilling that position? We do have an ALT slot, which if it's going to be vacant too long, we probably have to fill on an interim basis. The same is true for the selection committee. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So, indeed, the first thing that I did was to ask the EURALO board, EURALO has a board, and I asked the EURALO board on their points of view on whether we could take the candidate against the person which has stood down was—had been selected.

And the answers were "Oh yes, that could be a good expediting way to do this." But then one of our members was concerned about diversity, since Veronica has come from Eastern Europe, and is also a female, and so far, we've only got male representatives, most of whom come from Western Europe, except of course the nominating committee's selected person, who comes from Russia.

So, in front of this, and also with the fact that this was a public mailing list, I've also received some private emails from some people who would like to stand for the position. And therefore, rather than going for

a swift process, we have had to start the launch of a normal selection process. And I'm due, I'm hoping that I will receive from Sylvia. I emailed her. I haven't received a response.

ALAN GREENBERG: Will we have someone named in time to attend Hyderabad?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hyderabad, probably not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not Hyderabad, Copenhagen. Sorry, Copenhagen.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If we do find a time machine, we'll try for Hyderabad. If we don't, we'll settle for Copenhagen. And that's absolutely fine. As I said, the process should be—we've been through this now so many times. I think we should have a couple of weeks for expressions of interest, and then an election that takes place, also another couple of weeks.

That takes us to about the middle of February, until we've got someone. And because we are talking about the next meeting being in Europe, I don't expect that the flights will be over expensive for that person to have a flight at the very last.

ALAN GREENBERG: If they're far enough East, there may be a Visa issue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well even that, there isn't that much of a Visa issue except Russia. But we've already got someone who's been selected from Russia. The other countries, I believe, don't have Visa issues, in Europe, or in the EURALO region.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that was a flippant remark, not a really serious one. I will point out something that I find rather curious. You did have an election last time, and the other candidate could have won. In which case, you would have not had an Eastern Europe and a female on the group.

And that could happen again this time. So, just because you're having an election does not guarantee the diversity. And to answer Cheryl's question, I believe they were talking about diversity among EURALO members, not in ALAC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That is correct. It's Olivier speaking. If I may just add, we have, in our bylaws we said that we strive for diversity, but sometimes we just won't be able to achieve it because the skills aren't there and because the selection goes a different way.

But it's just the—leaving the opportunity open for diversity is important. And I didn't want to close this opportunity and then come in the far, later on, and say "Well, you've just expedited the process without giving a chance for everyone, for anyone in Europe to stand for the position."

ALAN GREENBERG: Move it as quickly as you can. Thank you. Any further comments? We're on AOB. I don't believe we've had any requests. Then only nine minutes over time. Thank you all for attending.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if you have any ideas on the falling through the cracks issue, either methodologies, spreadsheets, programs, software, whatever, we need something. This group is now adjourned. There is a smaller group of I believe Heidi, Gisella, León and I to talk about—echoes. Anyone else wants to stay, you're welcome to subject yourself to it.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]