
ALAN GREENBERG: And let us please start.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, we're going to get started. We're now officially going to start the recording as well as the interpretation for this call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Tuesday the 28th of February at 12:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Javier Rua-Jovet, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Kaili Kan, Sébastien Bachollet, Andrei Kolesnikov, Bastiaan Goslings, Alberto Soto, León Sanchez, Harold Arcos, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Seun Ojedeji, and Wafa Dahmani.

Yes, I did mention the Spanish speakers in this roll call, just to make sure that we capture all the ALAC members who are present on this call. We also have Julie Hammer, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon Orr, Yrjö Lansipuro, Adam Ahmat Doungous, Sarah Kiden, Barack Otieno, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Lianna Galstyan, Satish Babu, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Maritza Aguero.

On the Spanish channel, we have Alberto Soto – my apologies, Harold Arcos and Maritza Aguero. No one currently on the French channel nor the Russian channel.

Apologies noted from Daniel Nanghaka, Marita Moll, Leah Symekher, Aziz Hilali, and Murray McKercher.

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.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Evin Erdogdu, Yesim Nazlar and myself, Gisella Gruber.

We have French, Spanish and Russian interpretation today. Our French interpreters are Claire and Isabelle. Spanish, we have Veronica and David, and on the Russian channel, we have Galina and Ekaterina.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes but very importantly to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels, and to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, and welcome. I think this is the best attended ALAC teleconference I can remember in my history, that we have all ALAC members present but one, all liaisons present, and a good number of other people who are coming to visit and be with us for this meeting. So I'm very impressed.

First, I'd like to adopt the agenda. Seun has raised an issue which will be under Any Other Business. And are there any other comments on the agenda? You will note that very late last night – or my last night – I added an issue on the string similarity issue on ccTLD IDNs that has come to a boil recently and we're going to have to address it, and I'd like to at least review the situation during this meeting despite the short notice. No decisions, obviously.

Any other comments or questions on the agenda? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we'll assume it's adopted as distributed, and the first item is a Chair's announcement. We do have a number of changes and events as many of you – as all of you – know, no doubt.

First of all is the election of León Sanchez as the Board member to replace Rinalia at the end of the annual general meeting in November, and congratulations to León. León will be invited to participate in pretty much all Board events – not obliged to, but invited to – between now and then, so I'm expecting we're going to have significant scheduling problems because of that. But as was expected.

And number two, to welcome Bastiaan Goslings as the new member from Europe. He was recently elected by the EURALO ALSes to replace Veronica Cretu who volunteered. And Veronica was also the ALT member from EURALO, and Andrei Kolesnikov has been selected to represent Europe on the ALT.

So, welcome to you all, and congratulations to all.

The next item is action items. We have nothing of indirect interest to the ALAC, and it has a very nice zero minutes associated with it, which we already have gone over. But we are ahead of time, anyway. ALAC policy development issues, I'll turn the meeting over to Ariel to take us through any open issues there, or open anew.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. For the open ones, we have a public comment that we need to decide whether it warrants any statement, but I think we're

running out of time. It's GNSO initial report on the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP. The deadline is actually tomorrow, and I haven't heard from anybody showing interest to address this statement, so I'm just wondering whether we should close that and [send] no statement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We've had several people who are somewhat knowledgeable on the area, specifically me and I think León have looked at it and said there doesn't appear to be any issue. We have had an issue raised with us – although not the substance of the issue – by someone from WIPO, the intellectual property organization. That's an IGO. But I haven't actually made any contact with them, and clearly there's nothing we can do at this point. I suspect they're going to ask for support.

The gist of the message implied that they did not think that they're properly representable in this kind of process, and we'll certainly listen to them and if there's anything we can do to help, we will. But I don't think that will alter our position on the recommendations that are coming out of this initial report.

If anyone else has any comments, they can speak up, but I think that's the situation. So that one, I'm certainly happy that we're not doing anything. And all of the people who looked at it seemed to have supported that position, so why don't you go on to the next one, please?

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, thanks, Alan. The next one is the recommendations to improve ICANN's transparency. The deadline is April the 10th, and in fact, Olivier made a comment on the wiki workspace. I'm just wondering whether he or others have an interest in drafting a statement on this. And I've put in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we do have people – including myself, although not very active – on that subteam, and it is one of the issues that we will have on the table for discussion face to face. So, unless someone has something compelling to say here, certainly if anyone thinks that a substantive statement is necessary, then they should be preparing to take pen to paper. Preferably, it should not be someone who's part of the subteam. But we will be discussing that in Copenhagen, so unless there's someone who believes we want to discuss it right now, I'm willing to go ahead with this. We do have I think a fair amount of time, I think an hour and a half allocated to relative Work Stream 2 issues.

Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, go on, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The next one is the newest public comment is on the interim paper Cross-Community Working Group on the use of names of countries and territories as top-level domains. That will close on the 21st of April, and for the first time, I have heard from Barack – well, just from any community member who volunteered to draft a statement on this, and that's from Barrack Otieno – let me just double check. Yes, Otieno

from AFRALO, but then he wants some guidance on this in order to draft a statement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. Let me make a to-do for me, if we can have an action item that I'll contact him. That's an item we have almost two months. It's a substantive item. I think if we're going to make a comment, I think it has to be something that is done early and subject to good debate within our group. And I will counsel him that the first step I think is to put idea – not drafting statements, but start putting ideas into the wiki so we can consolidate them. And I strongly recommend that anyone else who has feelings on this one do something similar.

It doesn't have to be a definitive statement, but let's coalesce our ideas and see if we are all on the same page or if we have disagreements, which we may well. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. I don't want to belabor the point on this one, but I think it's important to recognize that whilst this is an interim report, the intention is for it to become a final report. It's almost a pro forma exercise. The Cross-Community Working Group—despite two rounds of sub-public comment on two- and three-character names was not able to find resolution on one or two issues, and so this is the state of play as a report.

What the plan is for going on or moving ahead on these very important topics – no one, including I believe all of the members of the Cross-

Community Working Group believe this is other than a very important issue with reasonable pressure from the GNSO part of the group were assisted and guided to realize that we had hit a stone wall in our several years of process, and that we would wrap this up with this final report, and then the matters need to be taken up under proper PDP processes which will be – sorry, the matters that are still unresolved without firm recommendation need to be picked up under GNSO PDP processes.

And so it's vital that when those processes start, that the At-Large Advisory Committee and indeed the Government Advisory Committee have a very good, active and well informed representation in the drafting of the charter of those PDP pieces of work and also in the ongoing PDP pieces of work.

Now, that said, some of this work will be subsumed by the activities of I think it's work team three of the subsequent procedures new gTLD work team. But it's planning on having a relatively light touch on this, recognizing that there is ongoing work.

It's just important to realize this is a stage in the process, not an endgame beyond the fact that this is a final report to wrap up a no longer viable in terms of outcomes Cross-Community Working Group. It doesn't mean that the work itself is disappearing, it's just moving form. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. And I think that highlights the fact that if this group has not been able to come to closure, there is some reasonable possibility there may be multiple opinions on the issue within At-Large,

and I think we need to know that was we try to populate any further groups that come out of this.

Any further issues on this one? Ariel, please go on.

ARIEL LIANG:

There's nothing else, that's all for public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I note the one earlier on the ALAC answer to accountability Work Stream on AC/SO accountability and transparency is still showing in the drafting stage. That one is subject to cleanup based on a number of comments, but other than that, it is final and that work will be done hopefully before Copenhagen.

There were no substantive comments. Seun gave a number of cleanups, and I think someone else did as well. And that will be submitted and integrated into the document, but no substantive change at this point. Going on to the next item, review of current ALS applications. Who's taking that one?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Hi, I've taken over management of that, so I'll just do a quick update. So far, the total number of ALSes is 220 in 99 countries, and we have a lot of activities in AFRALO with three new ALSes. It's ONG FEMMES & TIC, CACSUP, and AFADEC.

We have no recently decertified ALSes, but we are currently going to be voting on one in LACRALO, ACDI. We're also awaiting regional advice for two more AFRALO ALSes: ICT, Association of Malawi and AEPF-Tchad both for AFRALO, and we have a new application for the Armenian Internet Traffic Exchange Foundation or ARMIX in AFRALO. That should do it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Comments, questions? I'll note we do have a section dedicated to decertifications later. Any comments for Evin, or questions? Noting we are a little bit ahead of time, and we'll go on to the next item of reports.

It has traditionally been our practice not to have active reports, certainly not from all of the RALOs, liaisons and working groups, but increasingly, particular liaisons have had something to add, so we are adding a little bit more time to it than we have in the past.

I do note that in response to my last query after my last meeting, the RALO reports are somewhat more up to date. I haven't checked them all, but I know that there are now reports that are relatively current from RALOs that had been a year and a half behind. So, I thank you for that, and we will be monitoring this a lot more closely in the future.

Anyone with reports that want to focus on something which is not otherwise mentioned later in this meeting? And I note there is a ccNSO issue that will be talked about later.

Any other comments or input from liaisons, working group Chairs or RALO Chairs that need to be focused on? We don't have to use the time, but we can.

Wafa, go ahead. Gisella, is Wafa on the French channel?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, Wafa is on Adobe Connect.

WAFDA DAHMANI: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can now. Thank you.

WAFDA DAHMANI: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

WAFDA DAHMANI: Thank you, Alan. Thank you. I just wanted to speak a little bit about dotMobi. The thing is that we didn't hold any meeting within the [inaudible]. I saw that it's mentioned that it's preferred that we meet face to face during this ICANN meeting. They ask that they didn't plan to

meet this period, but they will send an e-mail if they have will have a meeting for dotMobi.

The thing is that they said to me that it could be the last word for dotMobi. Perhaps they will not need any more words for dotMobi. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Yes, I'm not particularly surprised. They're operating under a new contract now and it no longer requires them to have this Advisory Council. So I'm not surprised if you are presiding over the cessation, the end of this concept. Anyone else have any comments?

Seeing none, then – and I have nothing to call on any of the liaisons or other people for – we will go on to the next item, well ahead of time so far. At-Large review. Holly, Cheryl? Or would you like me to lead off?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'll start, first by saying that Alan has put up fairly comprehensive text. It's going to require introduction which I'll be working on, but obviously, anybody is welcome and indeed urged to make a report. Also, Olivier has been overseeing a comment from RALOs which is really welcome.

It's going to give us not only more comments, but actually be able to establish that it's not just the few of us who have actually drafted this. I've circulated earlier today – Sydney time – it's a reminder about the actual schedule and the steps that are leading up to the Copenhagen, and then afterwards, people forget that there is quite a bit of stuff that happens after ITEMS report goes to the Board.

I'm not going to go through those steps, everybody should have that. But just a reminder, we are really running out of time. We at Copenhagen have on the Sunday a meeting with ITEMS. It's a workshop, and we also have a workshop with them on Wednesday.

We have our own meeting to draft our own report, to finalize our own report indeed on the Tuesday. Public comment closes on the 24th of March, which basically should say to everybody we have a very short space of time to formulate our own response.

Very soon after that, ITEMS will have a draft final report. It will be shown to the working party. I'm not sure that we will have any opportunity to comment at all, simply that we will see their draft they provide, or we might provide a bit of feedback, but essentially, that goes to the Board.

If you looked at the steps subsequent in the e-mail today, you will see there's a lot that has to go on once the Board and the organizational review committee has their report. So, there's a fair bit of work ahead and a lot of it is pretty urgent.

Alan and Cheryl, would you like to add anything?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I have a number of things. But Cheryl, why don't you go first?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Very briefly just following on from Holly, I just wanted to suggest that the articulation of the ongoing steps that Larissa wrote in

an e-mail today and we're going to be forwarding specifically for the ITEMS Team to clarify a couple of things for them, and that Holly included in her e-mail to one of our lists earlier today, I think it would be wise, Alan, to have those next steps extracted from that e-mail and to be made in some way, shape or form part of this meeting record. Because we keep talking about the ALAC review and the record, and we keep talking about this public comment, but it's probably timely to have within our record that this is very clearly just a step on a pathway. Important work that has to be done for the deadline, but I think the way it's articulated is that could be somehow connected to the record for today's meeting under this agenda item, that would be very valuable. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. A number of comments. First of all, when we did the survey of what meetings do people want us to have in Copenhagen, the one that came at the top was as meeting with MSI and the Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

I'm not sure to what extent people may have presumed that this was a de facto meeting on the At-Large review, but we have scheduled such a meeting. Whether it's going to come off or not is going to depend to some extent on availability of Board members.

And Heidi, have we had confirmation that Rinalia and other OEC members can attend? Just a yes or no. Heidi seems to not be with us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Rinalia says in chat there is no meeting with OEC. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we have an interesting scheduling problem. We'll come back to that later. But one of the issues that was going to be talked about there was indeed reviewing the schedule.

Now we have an interesting situation. The ITEMS Team had a very major section in the earlier draft about how upset they were that the At-Large revised the Westlake report and came up with a new one. They were counseled that this was not an At-Large activity but a Board activity, but they still have significant comments saying At-Large changed the report.

It's not clear to me why they were even looking at that. They were charged with evaluating how well we implemented recommendations, and specifically, those were the recommendations that came out of the Board Committee. How those were derived was an internal ICANN issue. But nevertheless, they spent a lot of time on that issue.

The current process that is in place right now is quite different from what was there, and in fact does include a significant component where At-Large will comment to the Board on which recommendations we think are implementable and which are not. So, in fact, what they are complaining should not happen this time which they believed happened last time didn't happen last time but is part of the process this time. They seem to need a little bit of counseling, but that's not our problem. But we do have such a process that is coming up.

In terms of getting the comment ready, it has to be submitted shortly after the Copenhagen meeting, and we have no illusions that we're going to do lots and lots of writing either immediately after the meeting or during the meeting. So we have to go into the meeting with a pretty well finished, which implies the beginning of next week.

The crucial issues right now are to go through the draft and the intro that Kaili is working on and identify things where people disagree or there are things that are missing. Known to be missing are more details of the types of interactions RALOs have with regional organizations and their types of interactions they have with Internet schools of governance and things like that that we need to get a bit more flesh on.

Lastly, we are being described as being reactionary and reluctant to change anything because we are protecting our privileged positions. To the extent that we can critique their comments and not look like we are against all change, the better. That's not going to be an easy thing to do, because if you listen to Nick Thorne's words on the webinar that was held yesterday, he made some very strong and very derogatory comments about the motivation, what he perceives or what they perceive as the motivation for our reactions.

And to the best extent possible, we have to try to counter those. I have Sébastien next, and then Tijani. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. I would like to start with a French sentence, [speaking in French]. When you want to kill your dog, you say that is illness, and I guess it's what they are trying to do. I wanted to say two

things. The first one is this discussion and the subgroup show that we – as they suggest – don't need any groups within At-Large to discuss issues regarding the end users. And there's a second point, is that after nine months of work, they still don't know what is the difference between ALAC and At-Large, and that's troublesome.

For me, the rest, it's important, but it's just something we are losing our time because they make us losing our time. That's a pity, but I wanted to say that today on the ALAC meeting. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. Tijani.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. This is a bridge. Okay, Alan, my reaction about the webinar is very bad. I think that we didn't perform well, because we didn't ask the good questions for our community to understand what are the problems, and also to the other people from the other communities to understand that this proposal is not, how to say, a reasonable proposal.

I noticed actually the reaction of the [inaudible] from the GNSO. He said this report has the merit to shake the ground, but is everything that is shaking the ground held in merit? I am really surprised by this reaction.

And my problem is that our community, we, you, me, everyone didn't ask the good questions to make people understand the problems we have in this report. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. I'm not sure that that was the intent, but if it was, then it certainly wasn't well coordinated. A couple of things, respond to both you and Sébastien. I don't believe that they are trying to kill At-Large.

I do believe that several of the recommendations they're making would have that effect. They don't understand. There are many things they do not understand, that they have just gotten wrong in terms of both what we are doing and what we are supposed to be doing. I don't know how we can fix that, other than trying to make it clear in this set of comment. Whether it will succeed or not, I don't know.

The startling part of some of the comments that were made by non-At-Large people during that webinar is really, really shocking. For instance, the comment about how important it is to have knowledgeable people appointed to the NomCom. I agree completely, but the report did not suggest anything else. In fact, the report was completely silent on that.

The fact that Stephane Van Gelder who has a lot of experience on the NomCom, his cursory read said the responsibility of the NomCom will be

going down because of this report if it was all implemented, again, is somewhat shocking. Because if anything, it's going up and it's going up in ways that are potentially impossible. That is, the report is asking them to name people who both have wide experience in ICANN and are new blood, which is their original mandate. So, there are lots of issues that we have to try to address, and address in a quite proper and rational way in our comments. It is just one step, but it's a step we can't ignore.

Cheryl, go ahead. Cheryl has taken her hand down.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm still talking. Was I not unmuted?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you hear me now? Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right, I have no idea what happened then. I had to triple double unmute myself. Okay. I'm not as concerned at all about the webinar in as much as Tijani was outlining his concern about performance of specific questions.

When you look at who attended the webinar, the people who were not from the GNSO, from the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group, from the NCUC or from previous Nominating Committee activities were the people in the main who have had a strong voice on our interaction so far, and it was specifically requested during the beginning introduction of the webinar that those voices – in other words the voices of those of us who've interacted with ITEMS and this report to date – were not the ones that they were looking to hear from during this webinar.

So, I think our lack of specific questions is not a problem, because the webinar went exactly as planned, apparently. And that's okay. We have plenty of opportunity in the process to follow to have our input, and I think it was as necessary exercise. I just wish it hadn't taken 90 minutes of my life at the time of day, or should I say the hour of morning it did. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

The webinar was good for me. Let me now say this about renewing new blood. This before the webinar had been check so to say, has been [probed]. We had seen that this is not so. Everyone who seemed to be there for a long time, they have complied with the necessary terms.

So, perhaps these are long terms, I don't really know. But –

INTERPRETER: We apologize, we cannot hear Alberto very well.

ALBERTO SOTO: There are also other things on the webinar, on the recommendations and on paper. This is what we are doing. I'm not going to spend time explaining what are the ones that we know and what are the ones that we do not know. Sometimes, the – what we need is the rationale for the new model. We don't even need the necessary number of end users who we can reach out to to improve our functionality. They have already decided a change of model, and in spite of what we're saying, they will do the same thing. Or they would recommend the same thing.

So, I would suggest that we continue the way we are now, and we need maybe to prove that they're not right on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. Proof of course is in the eye of the beholder. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Once again, I asked for defining a strategy of our work. We didn't do. And the proof is that I thought that we asked for 90 minutes webinar so that questions can be asked in this webinar to make our case, to explain our point of view, more or less. Not to give our critical, but to ask questions to show people what is the kind of proposal they are making.

But unfortunately, my understanding wasn't the understanding of the others, so that means that our strategy is not really set. Yes, we have a very good – we did a very good thing. [inaudible] Alan made a very good step proposing a draft already that we can work on. This is very good. But [inaudible] for the public comment.

But we need other things [inaudible] for this review. If we don't do, I am not sure the result will be what you expect or what you want. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have one more comment, and then I'll do some closing comments. Javier Rua Jovet.

JAVIER RUA JOVET: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

JAVIER RUA JOVET: Can you hear me? Okay. I found the webinar good in some of the things that were said. In terms of our strategy as ALAC, I think the attitude we presented by people like Nick Throne is so ad hominem. It's so clearly prejudiced in many ways that I think it will fall down by its own weight, given the fact that the evidence is so contrary to what he says in terms

of things like entrenched interest and people who fear change or resist change.

My experience so far, the ALAC, the short experience is – what I've seen is that people who – the leadership people are the people who are working the hardest and the people who are spending the most time in groups, etc. So, the evidence is there that it's not – it's just a function of the fact that people work hard when they are in leadership positions.

So, given the fact that the facts are so strong and the truth is so clear in terms of why some people are in positions for longer than others, and it has to do with merit and hard work, my experience in the rest of my life tells me that clearly biased positions such as the ones shown yesterday will fall down by their own weight. I guess we should stick to a – just to make our comments in the process, but I really feel – I'm not as concerned as others in terms of the dangers of this process, because I think we're on the right side of the issues on many issues, and the good things about the ITEMS report – there are some good things there – we kind of all agree. And I think we in many ways disagree on the ones that are clearly wrong, so I think we are clear on our side, on the ALAC side. So, I'm not as concerned as others, actually. Bye.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Okay, a couple of closing comments. Sadly, I'm old enough that I've seen plenty of cases where people come in either as reviewers or new bosses and do really stupid things. They probably leave a few months later and the organization then spends the next five years recovering from their innovation.

That's not an uncommon story, so just because their ideas don't have merit doesn't mean they won't get implemented. I disagree with Tijani, I believe we do have a strategic plan. The plan is that ultimately, whatever recommendations they come [out] through with – which may or may not change in this current pass, but we have to presume worst case they don't change – we will have to make statements to the Board on whether the Board should accept the recommendations or not.

To do that, I think we need to be able to demonstrate that this is not the first time that we are saying this, that we have a written track record of having addressed these kinds of issues before. Of course, some of the things in the final report will be new and we won't have addressed them before. And I think we're building that track record right now.

The reason that we are putting so much effort into this response is not necessarily because we believe it will change it. It might, but we're not convinced of that. But so that we have the evidence that we have gone through this process diligently. And we will see it through, that's about all we can do at this point.

As I pointed out, in this process, unlike the previous one – even though the previous one involved chartering a brand new committee and writing a second report – we do get a say, at least advise the Operational Effectiveness Committee and the Board as to what we believe is reasonable and what is not. So, it's not the end of the process, but it's an important step in it.

In terms of the webinar format, I tend to agree. This was an MSSJ webinar. They did give the time to ask questions and to questions to be

asked. They unfortunately didn't answer any of the questions and said they would answer them in writing at some time in the future. When that will come out, I don't know.

Any final very short comments before we go on? I see there's been an active chat going on, I haven't been following it actively. Is there anything from the chat that needs to be put into the verbal record? Rinalia, are you able to speak? Do you have any advice at this point, or would you prefer to be silent? Hearing nothing, I presume silence.

Alright, the next item on the agenda is the ccNSO – and this is a mouthful – the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel, the EPSRP. To recount a bit of history – and there are most of the relevant documents are pointed to in the agenda, so you don't have to go looking for them. We won't be looking at them all today, but they are there for people who are interested.

As part of the IDN ccTLD implementation, there was a fast path process that we adopted several years ago. There is a desire within the ccNSO community – not unreasonably – to have a formal policy as opposed to an interim policy.

Part of that is determining how one recognizes confusingly similar – and I'll note that during the interim process, the fast path process, there were a number of examples of ccTLD IDN names that were held up because of potential confusing similarity. Some of them were released afterwards, I think maybe even all of them. I'm not sure.

In any case, there have been several iterations of an extended process, the Similarity Review Process, and the third report of this group was

published last year. Essentially, the report says we have to get these things out quickly. We can't afford the time delays. We just have to do a better, faster job of it.

The ALAC made a generally supportive comment, and I'd like to pull that up. If we can pull up the second document into the Adobe Connect screen and scroll to the last page. We're going to go to SSAC 84 next, if you can be prepared for it.

Alright, down a little bit so that we can see what the recommendations are. Okay, that's good enough. If you can give us scroll control so people can make it large enough. Thank you very much.

Now, you can see the indented bullets are recommendations, and we're basically supportive of the policy, but we end with, "The ALAC believes that the proposed guidelines will help promote linguistic diversity, mitigate the user confusion, preserve and ensure security, stability and interoperability of the DNS."

Shortly after we issued our report, SSAC came out with SSAC 84. If we could pull that document up, please.

There's someone making a lot of shuffling noise. If we can kill that line, I'd appreciate it. Or mute it, not kill it.

And we want to scroll to page six and seven, findings and recommendations. Just a little bit lower. Okay, the findings that SSAC had – and as I said, this was issued just after we submitted our report – the findings basically said that they believe that the recommendations of the EPSRP in the EPSRP report are not implementable, that the report

focuses too much on timing and the rate at which these things will be done, and not on ensuring a thorough review to ensure that there is no user confusion, no instability introduced into the DNS. And they are recommending to the Board that the Board not accept the report.

They're not disagreeing with the intent, but they're saying the process is too much focused on step-by-step processes and meeting deadlines, and not on the substance which they believe has to be done. And the complex substance for some scripts that has to be done to make sure that we have a stable world we're living in.

There has been a bit of correspondence between the SSAC and the ccNSO. Interestingly, I could not locate anywhere the letters from the ccNSO to the SSAC. The SSAC has published their responses as formal SSAC reports, as they always do. And apparently there was some criticism of – there was some misunderstanding on the concept of string confusion and instability or how they relate to each other. The second one, apparently the ccNSO had reacted to the fact that the SSAC was not showing proper respect by sending their report to the Board and not directly to the ccNSO. And you can see the responses in the final thing.

Lastly, if you can bring up the last document, the ccNSO to Board correspondence which is just from a little while ago, most of this stuff happened towards the end of last year. And note, all of these PDFs are linked into the agenda so you can find them all yourselves.

If we can scroll to page two bottom. The only thing to note there – that's fine – is they are asking the Board to implement a whole formal

policy, including the report of the string review panel, and they are citing the fact that the ALAC have supported their comment, and that's a rationale for this going forward quickly. The ALAC and the GAC.

Rinalia a day or so ago pointed out that the Board will be reviewing this in the near future, and they would like to know what our position is. When the SSAC report came out and it was clearly providing a different position than ours did, we did say that the group – and I think that was led by Cheryl who did the review – should revise it or review it and see if it needs any revision.

That came up again later in a discussion. As far as I know, there has been no such discussion held, or at least I'm not privy to the answers. So, the question is at this point, what do we do? We have a situation where we came out strongly saying we support the process because we believe it does not impact the security, stability of the Internet.

The SSAC that is charged with looking at security and stability issues says it does and will, and the process has to be more driven by function rather than timing. And the ccNSO is saying to the Board, "Please pass it." I believe we have an issue here that if we are disagreeing with the SSAC on security and stability, we have to understand it a lot more.

My personal feeling is I think we need a more nuanced answer than what we already gave in light on the SSAC's strong position, and they have stuck to their guns in the following correspondence. And that's where I think we need to do something and do it relatively quickly. But that's just me, and I guess I'd like to hear other people.

Andrei, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

Well, with IDN Fast Track, there were a couple of real cases where the applicants, basically a ccTLD applicant for the IDN domain were kept forever due to the similarity review and potential danger of the similar looking script at the TLD. And this process could have been like last forever, and there were real cases.

It's not just some idea. It's all impacting the applicant [at] this. And the reference – there was a reference actually to the process of the new gTLDs saying that, “Okay, here is a process for the string review for the new gTLDs, and why don't we have a formal process for the ccTLD IDN?” which is fair to my belief that there should be a process with certain dates and timelines so there'll be no endless going back and forth. And in this situation, I strongly support the ccNSO community to have this process in place as an instrument to judge basically the string similarity and potential danger.

From other perspective, there are definitely relevant links to the RFC, which says about the three core, major stones of the stability, security and confusion. So, I think that ALAC, At-Large should not take one or a second position in this situation. Probably it's a good idea just try to get people together and try to resolve the issue, have a compromise, have a process defined and a timeline, and have embedded into the process, in the process itself the necessary procedures to make sure the TLD is stable, secure and there's no similarity confusion. That's my point of view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Andrei. A good description of what has happened. My understanding from talking to people on both sides I guess is there's certainly no question we need to document a better process. We don't want to be in a position where things are in limbo forever without knowing how to get past that stage, which is what has happened in at least one of the cases I'm aware of that Andrei was mentioning.

The SSAC's position is, "Yes we agree with that, but the timeline should not be the sole thing that – that is, things automatically proceed if a time deadline has happened." I think we need to somehow come up with a clear process, but which has more the safeguards in it that the SSAC is looking at. Whether that's possible or not, I really don't know.

Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I hope I'm able to be heard, I'm on the phone now.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're quite clear for me. I don't know whether the interpreters can hear you or not, but I'm fine.

MAUREEN HILYARD: This afternoon I sort of sent out a summary. Basically, what you've got in the agenda [inaudible] those documents, but also highlighting what is actually being done in the December and January reports which are

actually sort of [inaudible] I thought on decisions that were made by the ccNSO in December and again in January.

What actually resulted after the review panel – on the instruction of the Council – reviewed the documents again taking into account the SSAC concerns, especially in relation to the conservatism principles which say have actually [inaudible] and the [cautionary] aspect of it were very important.

And also the RFC 6912 [inaudible] that was important, and it's both those are referred to explicitly, included into the updated version of the report. And so what has actually happened is that the report has been rewritten to include those concerns made by the SSAC. And the new report was actually endorsed at the January meeting, and that was reported on in my report and it has now been submitted to the Board.

I think there was – [inaudible] has been asking, do we still support them? I think that one of the things that I sort of thought about, if it had actually been a concern, I probably would have recommended that we review what we had actually supported initially, but I think in light of the fact that the new report [does] take into account the SSAC concerns, then I'm quite comfortable with that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Julie, do you have any – your hand is up, good. I was going to ask Julie whether the SSAC has it on its agenda to consider the new version and bless it or not. Go ahead, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Alan. I'm not part of that work party, so I'm not sure whether it has undertaken to provide feedback on that – the letter that the ccNSO sent to the Board, which was certainly copied to SSAC. There was no explicit request either from the ccNSO or from the Board to date for SSAC to provide a comment, at least not that I've seen. But I'll certainly follow up on that with the Chair of SSAC and find out whether the updated report from the ccNSO does in their view or in SSAC's view address those concerns to the point where the SSAC can go back and provide a positive comment to the Board.

So, I'll take it on as an action on me to go and follow up with the Chair of SSAC to find out whether there is a review by that work party to look at that most recent document.

I'd like to thank Maureen for such a clear summary which I only had a chance to see just before this meeting, but that was very helpful. Thank you, Maureen.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Julie. I haven't seen that summary yet. I did choose to get a few hours' sleep. It would certainly be nice if the two groups could play nice with each other and come to an agreement, and we aren't left in the middle.

So, let's await people reading Maureen's document and an answer from Julie, and we'll decide whether we need to do anything to be in the middle or in fact a problem has been resolved. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. And just a minor update just to make the ALAC aware and to have on the record that, of course, these particular matters are also being addressed in the Subsequent Procedure for New gTLDs Working Group, specifically within work track three, which takes the lion's share of string confusion objections and string similarities, including looking at the String Similarity Reviews that happened in the last round. But it also crosses over into work team four, which focuses on IDNs.

Certainly from my perspective, I'm constantly reminding out work teams that we need to interact more specifically and closely with SSAC on a couple of these matters. So, I'm hoping everyone will start playing a little bit more coordinately, if not nicely in the near future.

Just while I have the microphone though, and something that I think might be of use particularly to the regional leaders, we are the Leadership Team of all of the work tracks and the overall Subsequent Procedures PDP. And we've got draft and second draft done, so it's just polishing at the moment – a bit of a newsletter format to keep everyone more appropriately and more easily and digestively up to date with a huge amount of work that's going on in all of the different work tracks. These work tracks meet every second week and the pace is quite fast in some topics.

So there will be a newsletter. I'm assuming that we may put it out if not at Copenhagen than just after it. Then I'm thinking they're probably going to come out monthly. That will also take a little bit of the pressure off trying to keep everyone up to date on all of these things. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Any further comments on the EPSRP report?

Seeing none, hearing none, we will go on to the next agenda item. That's Agenda #10: ALS decertification. I am listed as the prime presenter on this, but I'm definitely not. So I will go to, presumably, Silvia?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, this is Heidi. [inaudible] by Silvia and Ariel.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. Thank you very much. We have four organizations, they are listed to be decertified – one from the EURALO, one from LACRALO, and two from NARALO. The wiki page with the certification in all four cases has the evidence and the organizations in all four cases requested to be decertified. The relevant correspondence with their RALO leaders is posted on the wiki.

Would you like to go one by one?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but relatively quickly. But yes.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. The first one is the Committee for a Democratic United Nations EURALO. [inaudible] stated that he wished to be decertified – that EURALO.

LACRALO on Saturday, January 7th, [Christian] said from Asociación Costarricense de Derecho Informático requested to be decertified because this ALS has been inactive for many years now.

The next one is N-CAP from NARALO, [inaudible], and she requested to be decertified. There is correspondence there on the wiki page.

The next one is the Association for Community Networking [inaudible] Michael Miranda. There is an e-mail back and forth between RALO leaders and Michael on this. This organization has been inactive and there are also attendance records and relations records. The suggestion, because there have been no responses for a while, is moving forward for decertification.

That's all. Over to you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Have the wiki pages documenting each of these been sent to the attention of the ALAC?

SILVIA VIVANCO: The wiki pages have all the correspondence. I believe that there is [inaudible] there was an e-mail from Ariel to the ALAC. I am not quite

sure of that. If there is a need for an e-mail, we can send an e-mail from staff to the ALAC [inaudible] move forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please do that. Either resend it if it's already been sent or send it again, asking ALAC members to review these documents. Let's give them, I would say, one week to come back with any comments. If they have any questions or concerns, they should be raised. Following that, we'll initiate a decertification vote, presuming there are no important issues raised in the process. So give people one week to come back with any further comments.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. Great. I will do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: An action item for that, please.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. Thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments on this issue?

Then we are on the last substantive issue, and we have a fair amount of time. We should be able to end very early at this point, which is nice. The next item is ICANN 58, the meeting coming up in a little bit over a

week at this point. I'll turn it over to, I presume, Gisella to take us through this. There are a number of issues that we do need input from, either during this meeting or very soon afterwards because, again, we're in the somewhat awkward position of raising issues with various groups, and we don't have the issues to tell them about ahead of time.

Gisella, over to you, please.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. I've just put the link in the chat of the ICANN 58 main schedule. If you do have any difficulties in downloading any of the meetings into your calendar, please do let us know and we can send you a quick e-mail on how to do that. I just know that one of the other groups had issues and we sent a quick instruction for that. But it should be pretty straightforward.

You will also find on the main agenda page what we call the one-stop shop wiki page. It's important to bookmark that, please, on your computers, as this is where the most updated agendas are posted for our meetings. All the agendas will be posted here, and I'm just putting in the link into the Adobe Connect chat.

So far, most of the agendas have been updated. If you don't see any on our At-Large wiki pages and you have sent them through, just bear with me. They are in progress, and they will be posted before the end of today. There are still a couple of outstanding ones.

On the ICANN main schedule, you'll also find all the special events that have been scheduled so far.

With regards to the wiki pages, what we will be adding and what we usually do in a different color are the main meetings of interest. Yes, again, it's been extremely difficult to avoid any clashes. Olivier and Alan and possibly others have been on some of the organizing committee calls. Copenhagen is, yes, again, another very busy meeting.

So please do bear with us when you see the clashes. It is absolutely impossible not to have any. We have done our best to avoid them or at least, if there are any clashes, we will look at how to manage those and possibly have different moderators for the sessions, etc., to allow people to attend the overlapping sessions.

I will now hand it over to Heidi for a quick review of the agendas. Heidi, please just let me know which pages you wish for me to display. I have them ready.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Before Heidi comes on, I'll note that, in the tentative agenda, we did have Leon chairing a fair number of sessions, typically ones I could not attend. We're going to have to try to coordinate with both the Board's schedule and Leon to find out whether in fact he'll be there for most of those or any of those and proceed accordingly. So we don't need to mention them explicitly during this review, but that will be an issue.

Cheryl, go ahead please, while we're waiting for Heidi.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Very, very brief little, tiny bit of administrivia. If staff would be so kind as to follow their link to our wiki space and note that

in the first sentence, where it says, “Visit the ICANN 58 meeting website for more information about this meeting,” that leads to the Hyderabad meeting. Perhaps if we had the correct link there with ICANN 58 it would be helpful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, it was such a good meeting we want to relive it. Just a little bit of humor early in my morning.

Heidi, are you ready?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I am. I’m going to very, very briefly go over what Alan and I have prepared for ALAC because I want to spend more time on the questions for the Board and the GAC and the GSE.

In broad sweeps, on Saturday we’re going to have, in the early morning, updates from the – let me just see. Sorry, I’m having issues with my wiki here. Okay, so yeah. In the morning we’re going to have some introductions with – sorry. Something seems to have changed – okay. I see what’s going on here. Okay. So we’re going to have introductions with the GSE, with Rinalia, if she’s available. Then we’re moving on to ALS expectations and communications.

Moving into the afternoon, we’re going to have updates from the working groups. This is because there’s going to be the joint EURALO-NCUC event. We expect that some people might wish to go to that. So we’re going to have some updates from the working groups here to allow others who may wish to go do that.

On Sunday, we are going to be inviting MSSSI staff to talk about the review. Unfortunately, we're not able to be there at that time. That meeting was MSSSI will be immediately before the meeting with ITEMS later on on Sunday morning, and then we move into an update on competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust with Carlton and Kaili.

In the afternoon, we have an update on the Work Stream 2 issues, ending the day with an ALAC-ccNSO meeting.

Monday, no ALAC meetings. There's a regional meeting. Tuesday we have the session of the ALAC on RDS and WHOIS activities. That's going to be moderated by Alan, but Holly will be leading that discussion. Then we have, in the afternoon, an open policy discussion. We end the day with the ALAC and GAC joint meeting.

Moving to Wednesday, it's primarily a RALO day, so I don't believe that there are any meetings of the ALAC on Wednesday. Yeah, looks like it's all the regional – EURALO will be having their [GM], and others will be having their [monthly] meetings. Thursday we end with the wrap-up session, as well as the dinner in the evening.

Now, just coming to the wrap-up session, we're going to be inviting Goran Marby and David Olive, and then we'll be hearing the report from the liaisons on that day.

I think that's it, Alan. We are going to be – just one final thing – sending all of the agendas to be transplanted this Thursday. We have been reaching out to everyone. If there are no agendas, they'll be putting in a very basic agenda in this page. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Heidi. I have Olivier's hand up, but first a comment. On the session we had scheduled with MSSl and the OEC, if Rinalia and the rest of the OEC are not going to be there, I cannot see giving an hour-and-a-half session to Lars and Larissa on the process.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I will agree with you there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we're going to have to do some rescheduling of that one and rethink what we do during that hour-and-a-half period.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Just to point out that the Tuesday afternoon is missing the European Stakeholders' meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you for that. We're still working towards our internal meeting that I mentioned to you, Olivier. Once we have everything close to finalized, we'll certainly add that information.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the major concerns I have is that the MSSl session on the At-Large Review has a strong conflict, specifically with the Auctions Proceeds Group, of which at least four ALAC members, including myself, will not be present at the At-Large Review.

I am still hopeful that there's a session on Monday morning which was nominally a high-interest topic which has received moderately little support from the Chairs. I'm still optimistic that that one might be cancelled and something moved into it. I did send a message on that last night. I don't know if there's been a response yet on it or not. So I'm certainly going to push heavily for MSSl's session to go into that slot if indeed it does get cancelled.

Any other general comments before we go into the specific ones?

Then we are on Item C: Questions for the Board, GAC, and GSE. We have had these discussions before in ALAC meetings. We usually get relatively little out of it. Moreover, when we get comments or suggestions put into the wiki, sometimes they are less than optimal when you look at the global picture. So we really need a good set of suggestions so we can then select from them ones that will generate the best, most interesting meeting.

We have enough time for comments here, but if we don't come up with ideas here, we really do need to work in the wiki and really need to work fast.

With regard to the Board, I'll note that Rinalia had some really good ideas at the very last moment last time. I'm hoping she'll have similarly good ideas, but this time a little bit earlier. So please make sure those are incorporated also.

Any other thoughts? We're looking at the Board, GAC, and GSE.

Heidi, the Board had promised us very quick turnaround in getting us their questions. Have we seen them yet? That was a long time ago.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

No. I'm still following up. I will see what the status is on that. If I could come back on the Board questions, Alan, I know that they haven't cited them yet, but it would be useful if we had the time to go over maybe at least one Board question from the ALAC. You know that we have staff that need to do briefings. It would be useful to be able to help you with that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It would be useful. On the other hand, the fact that they said they'd have theirs within a couple days and that that was several weeks ago – I believe that was the wording – makes me feel a lot less guilty.

I know that doesn't help your situation – being told you have to have briefings.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I know, but if we do a tit-for-tat sort of thing, that's not very useful [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not tit-for-tat.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, because we're having such a large number of people on this call, it would be useful if we could get some questions discussed to talk with the Board. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, to be clear, I have opened the floor for questions. I haven't seen any hands. Rinalia says, "Two questions drafted, one on Work Stream 2 engagement –" Rinalia, are these the questions that the Board will be asking us if they ever get around to it?

Ah. Okay. Thank you. "...questions, one on Work Stream 2 engagement by the community and one on policy priorities of the ALAC." "On Work Stream 2, how much engagement from" – I assume that means ALAC. "What help do you need to complete the work?"

We need more people to get actively involved in these working groups, which we don't have very much right now. I don't know how we do that.

“Do we have policy priorities?” Our policy priorities, I believe, are the ones that are currently the most critical ones that are going on within the organization, that is: WHOIS and the gTLD. I believe a policy concern we have, because we have expressed it multiple times, is the large number of critical activities that are going on in parallel and the difficulty we’re having in staffing them.

We have just approved membership of the CCWG auctions, and we have appointed four ALAC members and one ex-ALAC member, not because we are trying to put the ALAC members in a privileged position again. It’s because nobody else has applied who has any or near qualifications.

I see several hands. Alberto first.

ALBERTO SOTO:

I think we will need to clarify the function of the Complaints Officer because it seems there is some overlapping with the Ombudsman. Those are functions not really described anywhere, and it seems that those tasks are not clear when they need to call someone to cover that position. That job description says that that person will be in charge of the whole system. A very good way would be to know whether the Ombudsman is within that system because this would give independence to the Ombudsman. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Can we make sure that that is captured on the issue of questions for the Board? That's an action item for either Alberto or staff.

Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Sorry, Alan, I disagree with you. It's not for the Board to answer this question about the Complaints Officer, this office, and eventually other structures. It's a discussion we need to have within Work Stream 2. It's a discussion that we'd have within At-Large and ALAC without any trouble. The first person to answer the question about the Complaints Office is the CEO because he's the one who decided to create this office within staff and within Legal. Yes, there is no description outside of the job description in trying to hire somebody right now.

May I suggest that, if it's a topic we want to discuss within At-Large, I have committed a draft document about that? It was sent to Work Stream 2 participants. If you wish, I can send you the next version – it will be ready around the 3rd of March – to the At-Large or ALAC or whatever list you want me to send it to.

But that was not too much my point. My point was to try to see if the underlying question of the Board about Work Stream 2 and how much we need for At-Large to complete the work is something linked with possible schedule – postpone the end of Work Stream 2, as we will not be ready at the end of fiscal year. That's a discussion currently happening within Work Stream 2.

The third, short item was from the previous one. When you look to the schedule – I guess it's on Saturday – it seems that they're at the same time as the GNSO-ALAC joint session and the ALAC and the regional leadership working group session, Part 4. As you say, for the meetings it's difficult to have some people in one meeting and some others in this one. ALAC will need to be in two of them at the same time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm sad to tell you that you didn't disagree with me. All I said is that [whatever] suggestions should go into the wiki. I would appreciate your comment going in there also. We can then decide what it is that goes where.

So you're suggesting, among other things, that it be addressed perhaps in the session on Work Stream 2 issues. It certainly will be addressed by the Work Stream 2 group and therefore doesn't need to be raised to the Board at this point. Just make that clear.

In terms of conflict, I don't know how we fix this problem. I have made the comment, for instance, that the GNSO had fought for and received funds to hold critical PDP meetings outside of the normal ICANN window. That is clearly rather difficult with the new [bidding] strategy as it's being interpreted.

However, the GNSO at this point has willingly decided to hold the PDP meetings within the window of ICANN. That effectively disenfranchises people who have other conflicts and largely restricts the participation in those meetings to just GNSO people or people who can get out of other

things. That I believe is a direct violation of the intent that PDPs can be open for everyone to participate in.

At this point, it's no longer the [bidding] strategy that can be blamed on it because the GNSO has willingly espoused it. I'm not quite sure we address it, but I would suggest that is an issue that we need to consider and possibly raise with the Board. Again, I ask staff to make sure there's an entry to that effect. If you get the wording wrong, I'll try to fix it, but please, make sure the idea is captured.

Any further ideas or concepts?

Cheryl, the tick mark I presume was for what I just said, or was it an old one? If I don't hear anything, I'll presume it was supporting that

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Please, get some entries in there so we have some choice to try to pick out things that we think will generate the best conversation, and, more important, fix any problems. It's nice having neat conversations. It's nice that there's actually a benefit coming out of them.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. In light of the At-Large review being sent to the Board in the forthcoming future, would it be worth explaining to the Board how At-Large works?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not in that forum, I would think. That's my personal answer. I think the Board may have a better idea than ITEMS does in any case – certainly some Board members – but, other people, should we have tutorial on how At-Large works?

Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I agree with you, Alan. I think it's just not the place to do it. If we are going to explain in a very short space of time, it's going to wind up sounding very defensive, probably nowhere near long enough. It's not going to be thoughtful, and it's going to be premature. We don't know what the final report is going to look like, so we may actually be saying something we don't need to say. I just think that's really fraught with danger that we really don't need to take at this stage. Just my opinion, but that's the way I see it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. There's a chat going on between Rinalia and Tijani and others. I'm not quite sure how much of that is supposed to be filtering in to comments for the Board, but I ask them between the two to make sure that, if there's anything we want to consider as possible topics, then please make sure they get transferred into the wiki.

Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. While I agree that time is an issue, maybe this is not the time to talk about this to the Board in relation to the review. My concern is that, yes, we have, in the past, made comments on this particular document to ITEMS and then we didn't see anything [inaudible] in it. We need to take chances. Would we have the opportunity to meet the Board again to answer the questions? [inaudible]. I think this review is a priority for us. If it means that we have to look at the items of discussion again and reprioritize, I think we should do that, unless there's an agreement on the front end that there will be the opportunity to engage the Board or meet with them in the future before they actually make their decision on the final outcome of the final reports. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. You're talking about the ITEMS report, the At-Large review. Is that correct?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Exactly. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: As Holly's document that she sent out recently shows, and as we'll be going through again, there is lots of opportunity. We will explicitly be telling the Board which of the final recommendations – the final, not the

ones in this report – that we support, which ones we partially support, which ones we do not support, and why. There will be ample opportunity for that. That is part of the process. It was not part of the process in years gone by. It is part of the current process; that we will have lots of opportunity to do this.

Now, whether the Board will listen to us or not is a different issue. I'm not going to comment on that, although I think the Board imposing things on us that we believe would destroy At-Large would be an interesting situation if that indeed was how it was done. The Board has given ultimatums to ACs and SOs before. That was a long time ago and I'm not predicting it's going to happen this time. But life will be interesting. That's all I can say.

Seun, is that a new hand? I take it not.

Anything else regarding comments to the GAC, comments with the GAC, topics for discussion? There is a GAC and ALAC Leadership call that is being scheduled but has not been scheduled yet. If you have any suggestions on that one, then indeed we would like to consider them.

Olivier and then Yjro.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Actually, it's not a question to the GAC, but just a general question. I'm not sure who to ask this question to, but the GDD Summit (the Global Domains Division Summit) of this year is set to take place in Madrid in May 2017. I wonder: what is ICANN [doing] in that? Is ICANN supposed to run such summits?

It started three years ago. There was one in Santa Monica, the one last year in Amsterdam, and the one this year is in Madrid. It used to be an ICANN conference, but it's solely restricted to the industry. The agenda from last year seems to be looking more at how to market domain names. You've got all sorts of discussions taking place while it's clearly restricted to contracted parties. I just find it a bit strange that ICANN would be paying for something like this. I wonder whether we should be touching on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's certainly a valid topic to comment on if we think it's a concern. I welcome input on whether this is an issue that we want to step into or it's something to avoid.

Yjro, please.

YJRO LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Alan. As far as the meeting with the GAC is concerned, as of now we have four items on offer. First of all, the GAC Chair, Thomas Schneider, has proposed an item which is like best practices for geographic names in [inaudible] of the new gTLDs. The GAC has a working party that is thinking of this, and they will have a meeting. They have a draft, basically, before our meeting, and they want to talk with us about that.

The second item is something that we agreed on already in Hyderabad; that is to say, the Council of Europe study on community applications

for gTLDs. As we said in Hyderabad, there may be points that the GAC and ALAC could agree upon.

The third – that was put by Maureen – is a GAC draft survey on underserved regions.

The fourth one, which is through my suggestion, is that perhaps we can answer the GAC if they have questions at this stage about the At-Large review. We could perhaps explain that and give our points related to that.

So these are the four points we have so far. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi, paper copies of the report related to community TLDs were supposed to be distributed to all ALAC members. Did that happen?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, can you just add a little bit of context? I know that the paper from the Council of Europe – is that the one you're speaking about?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's the one I'm speaking about.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, they have then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I already had mine, so I –

HEIDI ULLRICH: They should have all received them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then we should send out a note asking ALAC members to at least have perused it because it will be discussed with the GAC. If we could have an action item on that, I'd appreciate it.

Anything else?

All right. I'm not going to belabor the point of keeping this meeting going forever, trying to extract ideas, but we really do need them. They're going to be invented by me or anyone else I can buttonhole if we don't get ones contributed by other people.

Thank you very much. Last item is Any Other Business. Seun – no, I'm sorry. We still have other items within the meeting. Planning in outreach and engagement. Olivier and Dev – I don't know if Dev is on the call or not, so Olivier, I think it's yours.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. A couple of things we'll be happening over the week. You've already heard that on the Saturday afternoon there will be a joint session of EURALO and NCUC that will be entitled "What Can You Change at ICANN?" It's an outreach and engagement session. The whole agenda of it will be active people from the At-Large

community and active people from the NCUC speaking to Newcomers and engaging in a roundtable discussion with them to try to answer their questions and give them an idea of why they should join and why maybe now is the best time to join; what's so different this year as opposed to prior years?

The second thing that is going to happen specifically for capacity-building is, later on the week – I haven't got the agenda. Is it on Wednesday – just checking with the staff – or the Thursday when there could be a lunchtime session –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You're correct. Wednesday.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Wednesday. Okay. Thanks. We're working with Tijani on this. That's going to be looking at specific policy issues that At-Large is engaged in and discussing it with Newcomers, including the NextGen and including the Fellows. It's taking place during the lunchtime because it's been so hard to find a session that was non-conflicting with other sessions.

Again, it's a very open discussion. We're not going to go through the whole thing of what At-Large is and how we're structured, etc., because most of this entry point stuff is being discussed early in the morning when the Fellows and the NextGen receive the visits of the different Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee Chairs and the GNSO constituency Chairs as well. So we'll be looking more at a topic-based conversation.

If you have any suggestions for some of the hot topics that we should discuss, then please send them in. We'll probably be looking and using the main issues for Europe – it's [inaudible] based in Europe – on the document that was drafted a while ago that listed some of the big issues in Europe. We'll be focusing on some of these.

These are the two big outreach things. There is a European Stakeholder Engagement session, again, not only for At-Large but for all people that are from Europe-based – I think it's on the Tuesday afternoon from 3:15 onwards. There'll be a little cocktail at the end of that you'll of course all be invited to attend.

That's the last thing out of all these specific activities. Obviously there's the EURALO General Assembly, but that's just really going to be of interest to people in EURALO. There's also the Global Equal Multistakeholder Band that will be playing on Tuesday evening at the end of the day. More details will be made available soon.

That's all for the time being. I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. I see no hands. Is there anyone who has anything they want to raise?

Then we'll go onto the next item: social events.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. Just to mention that any special event will be [inaudible] wiki pages. We currently have the gala event, which is on Monday evening. It's hosted by the local Copenhagen host. At the meeting, they [inaudible] things very easy for us.

As Olivier mentioned, on the Tuesday evening we will have the band playing. More details will be posted on our wiki page. On the Thursday, we have the wrap-up cocktail. Following that, we will have the dinner that we're trying to book at the Bella Sky Hotel, just for everyone to move swiftly from the cocktail ending at 8:00 p.m. and onto our dinner. It is the ALAC regional leaders and liaisons. Anyone else from At-Large who is there who will be joining us, please do contact me.

Just in case anyone is wondering whether we're inviting everyone to dinner, which is not the case, you'll be picking up your meal bill. ICANN Policy will be paying for the drinks, to a certain extent. So we look forward to seeing everyone in Copenhagen very soon. Please do follow our one-stop shop wiki page. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Gisella, question: you said the ALAC dinner will be in the hotel. Copenhagen is an unbelievably expensive city, and hotels typically are at the high end of that expensiveness. Are there other options really nearby? I know the convenience of being in the hotel is nice, but I'm just wondering if it's possible if there's anything else half-decent that might be of a lower cost than the hotel that is within very quick distance?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, we are exploring those options, but I'd just like to point out, with the logistics of dealing with this dinner and people who add themselves at the last minute or, more importantly, drop out at the last minute, for every single group dinner that has been organized that I'm aware of through our support team and other people organizing group dinners, everything has to be paid for up front. Someone has to leave a credit card and guarantee that people who don't come we still get charged for.

So as much as this is a dinner that we're more than happy to organize, we are aware of how it usually happens with people dropping out, and we are going to get into very tricky bills.

The other issue is that many of the restaurants – again, that are being seen in parallel of other groups organizing – don't do individual bills. So it is actually arriving with cash or we can't pay. Again, we're going to have payment issues.

Hence, that's why we've gone for the hotel, where hopefully they will be a little bit more flexible. But we're still working on the details.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Just curious. I haven't been in Copenhagen for a very long time, but the last time I was there I was overwhelmed at how high the prices were, and that was many decades ago. So I'm a little bit leery. I haven't had the nerve to look at the per diem yet. I suspect it's not going to quite cover what the real costs are, but I'm hoping that's not the case.

Lastly, logistics. Is there anything we need to add? We're all in the same hotel. We're all in the conference hotel. That doesn't often happen, but it's a glorious time when we are.

Yes, Seun, many decades, I'm afraid.

Anything else that we need to take about on logistics?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Nothing yet. If there is anything that does come up, I'll make sure to put it on the mailing list. As you said, we will be at the conference venue. Breakfast is included in the room rate. Meetings do not start before 8:30. That is ICANN moving forward, as you've noticed, over the past several meetings. We don't start before 8:30 in the morning. So being onsite at the hotel will make everyone's life easier and give you a little bit more sleep.

As I said, I will be on the ground next Monday. If there is anything that I think is of importance for everyone and which will help you logistically, I'll make sure to get an e-mail out to everyone. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Any further comments on the ICANN meeting in Copenhagen?

Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Just one last thing. Of course, you've all noticed that there will be some conflict between the Capacity Building session and the Outreach and Engagement session and other things that are happening. I would be grateful if we could have some volunteers from our community to take part in those discussions with Newcomers. Please, could you let me know in advance whether they'll be joining the ALAC session or whether they'll be joining the Capacity Building and the Outreach sessions? It would be helpful, one, for numbers, and two, for me to know if I need to specifically ask some people to be present. It would be a bit of a pity to have an Outreach session with just one or two people from At-Large to talk to people. So I just want to [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENEBERG: Thank you very much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm going to put my Academy cap on for just a moment, just to let you know that the 2017 course of the leadership program will take place from the 8th to the 10th in March. We have Andrei and Javier [coming] through that as some of the ALAC members. The others are some of the

RALO leaders. We have a great program for that. We'll be sending out logistics for that very shortly.

Also, for all of you have been through the leadership program, who are alumni, if you could please be sure to come to the Academy Working Group meeting because there's going to be some important discussions held there about the future of the Academy and going forward. So I would hope to see all of you there. I think it's going to be Wednesday. There might be a conflict, but we will update you on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier, a new hand? Old hand?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's a new one, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then go right ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. Again, I'm sorry for this third incursion into the call, but there was also a deal struck with the booth run by ICANN. I wanted to let you know that we will be able to make use of that location as a meeting point. It would be good to have a [inaudible] of people that would be actually going to the booth over the breaks. We don't need people, of course, when there's sessions on. But during the break, it would be good to have someone.

Again, if you want to volunteer, drop me a note or a drop a note to staff, and we'll follow up. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, if I might, just to clarify that a little bit, there is a wiki page for everyone's convenience so we don't need to go through you or staff. There's just a wiki page that you can put your name and which time you'd like to do that on. Silvia will be leading that, coordinating all the information that you need. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Heidi. I would be helpful to have the wiki page in the chat, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I'm sure that staff will do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Done. Any further comments? Heidi, your hand is up. I presume it's an old one.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh. Old hand, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. We are done with that agenda item then, I believe. We have Any Other Business. Seun had one item he wanted to raise. Is Seun still with us?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello? Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you. Let me say what I have. One just came up [inaudible]. One of the [inaudible] in relation to ALAC. Congratulations, again, to Bastiaan, and welcome to ALAC.

I was just checking the SOI, Bastiaan, and even though I'd like to note that its last update was in 2009 [inaudible], noting that he was intended to be a member of ISPCP [inaudible] acronym, which is part of CSG. So I wonder, does it mean that we're going to be losing Bastiaan any time soon? Or does that actually cause any conflicts? Valid question to ALAC. So the [inaudible] is that Bastiaan is actually a member now, and if that is the case, does it cause any conflict in terms of our rules?

The second comment is in terms of Leon. Shouldn't we start discussing soon the replacement for the CCWG? I note that Leon will finish his time at ALAC just as he getting into the Board. So [inaudible] for that, but for the CCWG, is this something that we want to look into? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Seun. I'll address both issues. I can't speak for any of the individuals who can resign from anything any time they want, but in terms of obligations, it is not that unusual to have an ALAC member who is also active in some other part of ICANN. We have had Edmon Chung, who runs the .asia ccTLD/gTLD. Wafa and a number of other ALAC members have certainly been parts of the ccNSO, and at times even members of the ccNSO Council. So those things are not uncommon.

We have initiated but have never really got into the substantive discussions of: should we have rules regarding voting rights, and should someone who is a voting member of ALAC be required not to be a voting member of other groups?

In the past, we have addressed that informally. Perhaps the ALAC wants to be more formal on it. But certainly there is no rule about participating. Your issue, however, is relevant and we will need to consider to make sure that not only don't have a conflict of interest but make sure that we don't have a real conflict of interest, or rather an apparent conflict of interest. So from that perspective, it is warranted that it be raised.

In terms of Leon, Leon has no obligation to resign from any of his current positions until he actually steps into the Board's seat, which is at the end of the AGM. He of course has the right to resign from other positions if he feels it's no longer appropriate or if the time constraint does not allow it. He's served no notice at this point that he plans to.

If indeed we feel that we believe at the time that he becomes a Board member that the CCWG Accountability is still sufficiently active that need or want to replace him as a co-Chair, that will be an option that we'll have to look at much closer to that point, unless, of course, he decides to resign from the co-Chair position a lot earlier, in which case I'll wait for him to tell us that. I don't think we'll put him on the spot on this meeting right now.

I'll note that Becky Burr, while she was an elected member to sit on the Board – sorry. Heidi, are you trying to get in?

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR:

That was Holly. I think she was talking to someone else.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Sorry. Sounded like Heidi. Unless Leon chooses to announce to us that he wants to leave early, at this point I think we will have to play it by ear and decide just how active the CCWG is at the time and go ahead.

As I was saying, there's a precedent with Becky Burr taking a lead role in the CCWG after she was named as an incoming Board member but before she took her seat. So there's plenty of precedent for that, so I don't think we need to worry about that at this point.

I'm not sure whether that addresses both your issues, Seun.

Sure. Okay. Thank you.

Alberto, you're next.

DAVID: This is the interpreter. We cannot hear Alberto right now.

ALBERTO SOTO: Apparently there is a logistics problem. Constituency Travels usually sends our information to go from the hotel to the ICANN meeting. Lately, they haven't been doing this. If it's so expensive, probably in terms of those areas, Transportation has implied one day of per diem. So perhaps it would be great if Constituency Travel could provide us with this information again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. I didn't follow what the question was. Did anyone else pick it up and can restate it? I know [inaudible] about Constituency Travel and per diems, I think, but I'm not quite sure.

Leon, go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. I believe that Alberto's question is a request for ICANN Travel to provide information on how we can get from the airport to each of the hotels in which we will be staying at the least cost, since lately they haven't been doing so. It would be useful to have that information from ICANN Travel once more. I guess that's what Alberto's requesting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I believe that there are a bunch of options. My recollection is that NARALO has put together a rather extensive document on many issues, including transportation. So maybe we could have staff verify if that document is in fact finished and make sure everyone has it. But, yes, one way or another we should make sure that travel from the airport to the hotel is available. I've seen a number of options and I think it was in that NARLO book. But one way or another, we should do that. Thank you, Alberto, for reminding us.

If I could ask for a staff action on that, please.

Sebastien, you put a comment in the chat. Do you want to say it for the verbal record?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. I thought I'd put it in the chat because I didn't quite follow the response to Seun's questions because I was on another phone call, just for the record.

In my SOI, there is indeed a referral to becoming member of the ISPCP. I put in the chat that I have been talking to them in regard to [inaudible] and becoming a member of them. So that was not me, myself, becoming a member in that capacity, but I will be representing that this is an infrastructure platform within the ISPCP if they would become a member. As of yet we are not a member. So that's the context. If such a platform would become a member of the ISPCP and I would be representing them, I don't know if other people know if that would

mean a conflict of interest because I have definitely no intention of – I believe in ALAC. I really want to dedicate my time and make the best of it there. So if there would be conflict of interest, I would not be able to [inaudible] platform.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. No, the answer was: we do not have any formal rules at this point. We have handled such cases on an ad hoc basis before and certainly will again if necessary. We may come up with rules on day. We presume at the very least you would not be a voting member of both at the same time because that would be deemed to be double-dipping. They indeed may already have rules about people who participate in other parts of ICANN also participating or voting in the ISPCP, but I can't speak to that.

So at this point, we will handle it on an ad hoc basis and try to make sure that we are completely open and don't have any perceived conflicts. I don't foresee a problem. We have had similar cases with a good number of people over the years, and none of them have ever blown up on us.

The only time we have had a problem –

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS:

[inaudible] information.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry?

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. That's fine.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Just to confirm, following up on what Seun asked, I will adapt my SOI accordingly so that it reflects correctly that I might be representing that particular industry body. But I will not become a personal capacity member. So that that is reflected correctly.

ALAN GREENBERG: But if you are representing them and voting in that, then that might be viewed as a problem. But let's handle it offline. The only time we have had an actual problem in the past is when someone has been a member of two councils and chose to go to their meetings and ours but incidentally took travel funding from us. That we considered a problem, but other ones we've been able to address.

Any further comments before we adjourn the meeting? We are actually, despite the fact that we were way ahead of time, we are eight minutes over, I suddenly see.

If there are no other comments, I thank you all for your attendance. I think this was a really good meeting. I'll look for you offline and see you in a little over a week in Copenhagen. Bye-bye.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, everyone. The meeting has been adjourned. The audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call. Wishing you all a good morning, good afternoon, and good evening wherever you may be. Very much looking forward to seeing most of you in Copenhagen. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]