
YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team Mid-Monthly call, taking place on Thursday, 9th of February, 2017, at 22:00 UTC. On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, Julie Hammer and Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

We have received apologies from Gisella Gruber, and Maureen Hilyard will be joining us soon. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. Finally, if I could please remind everyone to state their names before speaking for the transcription purposes. And over to you, Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Does anyone have any comments or questions on the agenda, or any other business? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we will accept the agenda as posted and turn the call over to Ariel Liang to look at the policy issues.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel Liang speaking. So we don't have that many things in the pipeline, and there's one that Alan drafted. It's the ALAC response to CCWG-Accountability WS 2, SO/AC Accountability Subgroup questions. So, that one is on the Wiki now, and we're soliciting comments from the ALAC's members and RALO leaders, but so far I don't think we have got

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.

that many input yet. So if you can take a look at that and provide some input on the Wiki, or direct email to Alan, that would be great.

And then, the second thing that's in the pipeline, is of course the At-Large Review Draft Report and we all know the public comment close date is the 24th March. So, I think there will be a part of this call dedicated to discussing how ALAC is going to respond. So I'll skip that now.

And then the third one that's also ongoing is the GNSO Initial Report on the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanism Policy Development Process. And the public comment close date is March the 1st. I did send an email to the ALAC asking for volunteers to look at that public comment, but nobody volunteered so far. And that's pretty much all for our public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I did attend a briefing on that the other day, and they seem to be taking a minimalist and quite rational approach, essentially saying, pretend that the rights that IGOs have, INGOs they're excluding altogether, they're essentially private organizations that can use standard copyright and trademark. And for IGOs, they're essentially saying, pretend that their trademarks and telling the URS and the UDRP to handle them under their normal rules, factoring in the differences between them.

And they're addressing the fact that an IGO may not want to use a national court because that essentially says they are subject to national laws. And they're providing a way of doing that, using an agent, so they

are taking a very minimalist, very rational position, I don't think we have any real thing to say about it. And I would suggest unless someone has a strong feeling otherwise, that we not comment on it. Any thoughts on that? I have one other issue to raise.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That wasn't my agreement on that, Alan, but still I want to register it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The other thing is what is the status of the draft budget and operational plan and budget? I thought it was supposed to have been published by now? I don't see it listed on the list. What's the status? Does anyone know? Staff or any other one? Anyone else, or Tijani who follows these things more than I do? Anybody? No?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan, this is Heidi, I'm going to be contacting Xavier or someone else in Finance right now, and I will let you know. Good question, it should have been out.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought it should have been out already, and I vaguely remember I saw something published, but I don't remember for sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I'll get back to you, shortly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Anything else on policy issues? We'll revert back to it if there's any news. And we'll go on to any updates from the liaisons. Any of the liaisons on the call have anything they want to report, discuss, raise or whatever? Yrjö has his hand up, go ahead, Yrjö.

YRJO LANSPURO: Yeah, thank you, Alan, this is Yrjö Länsipuro speaking. I met Thomas in Tallinn the other day, we were preparing for EURODIG, and he suggested that an item for the joint ALAC meeting in Copenhagen, they say that is now in sort of renewing or reviewing their stand on geographic names. Unfortunately, I don't have any details so far, but if we would be interested in exploring this, first in this joint meeting of the Leadership Teams at some point in February I think that the staff is preparing that call. And then in Copenhagen I could try to get more details on what that thinking is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. My gut feeling is this is one of the issues, perhaps one of the few, but certainly one of the issues where we're diametrically opposed to the GAC position. Government representatives tend to take a pretty strong view that no one should be using their name without permission and going through whatever process. And we have generally taken the position that we believe there is no confusion, and names should be made available. But it's certainly something we can talk about, I'm not sure we're going to see a lot of change in either side on that, but it

might be an interesting discussion. Maybe one of the things that just to show we're not in lock step. Anyone else have any thoughts on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, if I may?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Cheryl for the record. I can see my laptop at a distance, but I'm actually trying desperately to water some plants before they all expire in 42 degrees heat here today. I think there's enough -- yes, I think we should have that on the agenda, Yrjö, I think that's an excellent idea. Because if there's a number of wires on this that we need to look at, certainly, the work done and their interim report which would become a final report out of the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs, will be out soon for public comment.

So, it probably will be something that it's worth us a good discussion out at the Copenhagen meeting. And my gut feeling is, having worked on that and its predecessor for many, many years now, that there will be aspects that we are likely to be more in agreement with GAC and has been typically characterized. I am concerned, also, that now that particular cross-community working groups between the ccNSO and the GNSO and the rest of us, has pretty much turned up its toes, that when the conversation about usage of geographic and territory names comes into the subsequent procedures for new GTLDs, that if they take the

advice and if they actually start a somewhat separate process, that as if often the case, Alan, and something you've complained about, over many years, the sheer weight of brand and industry interest in that working group is going to far outweigh and therefore unfairly bias outcomes, compared to the probable interest of end users and to a certain extent governments and local governments. So, I just think we need to look at where there is a nexus and work out where we agree and where we don't agree. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, I've just recorded, I did have my interview with the CEO today and one of the issues was that he focusing on is how does one resolve policy issues when things come to the board with various sides saying different things. And I gave my standard answer of, it's going to be really difficult. Because just reverting it back to the GNSO does not mean you're in a position to really debate something and come to a compromise.

I'm curious, however, if you're saying you think there will be more nexus than the past, I wasn't giving a value judgment, but in the past the ALAC has come down pretty strongly in most cases, maybe all, but I can't remember for sure, where country names or country codes were being talked about that we opted for more liberal rather than more restricted. So, I'm just curious where you think there will be more of a nexus?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, for example, exact matches to countries in, are likely to have the at large residences of this country, it's a little more concerns than not, I

can assure you. The Australian population internet Australia as a peak body and as an at large structure would take a relatively dim view of some Wisconsin teenager running dot Australia.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're not talking about top level domains, though, I don't think.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We are talking about top level domains. That's exactly what we're talking about.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I wouldn't have thought that's even open for discussion again. Okay, it shows I haven't been paying attention, so I will shut up for the moment, and turn the call over to Julie had her hand up, Leon were you wanting to speak about countries? Or, I suspect Julie was talking as ASAC liaison.

LEON SANCHEZ: It's Leon, yes, I wanted to speak about the country code names.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then why don't we go to you briefly and then go to Julie?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. Just to say that I agree with what Cheryl said, that we might be more in line with the GAC this time. I've had access to a draft

document, from the GAC representative in Mexico, he sent it to some people here, that they know that our interaction with ICANN and of course, I'm one of them, the proposal from the GAC seems quite reasonable to me, in regards to the country code names for next top level domain rounds. And I think that even though we have had more liberal positions in the past, these draft default rules that they are trying to actually propose, seem very reasonable to me, and in fact, they are pretty much in line with the trademark law with which I'm familiar with, so I guess, yes, it's maybe too soon to tell, but I think that we will be more aligned with the GAC on this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, just for the record, I think we've always supported at the top level, having the restrictions, I don't think there's ever been any disagreement there, it's at the second level that I think there's been more of a split between the two. But in any case, Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Alan, just wanted to give the group an update on where I believe the situation is with the EPSRP, the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel issue for IDCCT of their fast track. It's almost an incomprehensible topic name. You might recall that there's been some to-ing and fro-ing between the ccNSO and the SSAC on this, and thirdly, with some, I guess, not particularly happy interactions. The EPSRP was proposing a secondary set of evaluation criteria for proposed IDNC [inaudible] where they had been judged under the first evaluation

criteria to be, I guess, confusing and rejected and the second lot of criteria gave an opportunity for that to be reviewed.

What the SSAC was doing in SSAC was zero eight four was saying we don't agree with these next set of criteria which would enable [inaudible] TLDs to be approved that has actually been rejected by the original criteria. So, there's been a number of documents back and forth between the ccNSO and the SSAC those documents in the SSAC were published as SAC AD 8 and AD 9.

I believe where it's now at, although I haven't seen the document, is the ccSNO has basically gone back to the board and said, "We don't agree with what the SSAC has said, and over to you to agree the set of criteria proposed as EPSRP." So, that's where it's at the moment, and I think the board haven't yet considered that issue. I haven't seen the document that the ccNSO has sent to the board, although I'm not sure whether it's a public document or not. And I'm not sure whether Patrick's seen it so that's about where that issue is at. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The ALAC comment on it was more for the ccNSO and the faster path than against you'll recall the SSAC before it was published after we submitted our comment. The question arises is do we want to rethink that formally, and take any position on this or not? I'm not proposing this group discuss it right now, but is that something perhaps we should be discussing in Copenhagen and is that too late?

JULIE HAMMER: I think it would be useful to have Maureen's view on that, it's difficult for me to say, well ALAC should change their minds, or I don't know, Maureen's perspective would be really helpful here.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I was really addressing that at the ALT Members, not the liaisons who I understand perhaps have to take certain positions, even if you don't agree with them, sometimes. But I'm not saying you don't, so that question was aimed more at the other people and it doesn't have to be answered today. But if it's going to be put on the Copenhagen agenda, then we really need to do it sooner, rather than later. And if Copenhagen is too late, then we need to know that also. Cheryl, go ahead, and then we'll go to Maureen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, just to encourage the ALT to consider positively putting this as part of their discussion with SSAC, and you could probably fit in [inaudible] in Copenhagen. Would be from my point of view, as one of the co-rapporteurs of work team four, out of the subsequent procedures for gTLDs, PDP process. Only earlier today, we had our primary meeting of that sub-team, relating to matters of IDNs and new gTLDs.

And one of the changes we made to our current consensus text language was to encourage some form of collaborative effort to start soon and run in parallel with the PDP process running on new gTLDs to look at a couple of issues, this could very well be one of them. But includes things like single characters and security and stability of those

as well, and we added, surprisingly and not supported by me, that the SSAC should be part of that collaborative group if possible. So I think if ALAC could have its thinking clear as well, that might be very useful. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Anything further on that subject? If not, I'll turn over to Maureen, not necessarily to defend a ccSNO position on this, but just to give any report, or whatever you like.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Can you hear me? Great, just a small comment on the SSAC issues. I do understand that the ccNSO did reconsider the issue as they were requested. But although they sort of like indicated that there was some change, I'm not sure that it was any significant change. And their justification was that others had agreed with their original decision, but the discussions they had in the Council didn't give me an idea of what those changes were, if any, were made at all. So, I can't comment too much more on that. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine.

MAUREEN HILYARD: But next Wafar was officially sort of like endorsed in her role as the ccNSO liaison to the ALAC at this morning's meeting. And up 'til now I've been providing the brief, ALAC reports to the Council and so she will

take that over and I was expecting Wafar to be at this meeting, because she's the .mobe liaison, is she not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, she is, well, the liaisons that are formally invited to this are the liaisons to the ACSOs, not to other groups.

MAUREEN LYARD: All right, okay. And the final thing, is that if it would be possible for us to raise some topics for the agenda, I don't know if those have been finalized from our point of view? And but they would like to get some idea of what it is that we would like to raise at that meeting on Sunday at 5:00. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, and we'll cover that or go into that in perhaps more detail when we get to that item. The only, one sec, the only thing that I'm curious about is you said that was a point, Wafar was appointed this morning?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, it was sort of like an official, I mean, it was mentioned at the last meeting that they'd just had the vote, and that she had been select, chosen according to the vote. But that her role was going to be officially sort of like, because my name, I didn't realize that my name was actually down to write ALAC reports until I happened to be going through the agenda and quickly sent them a very, very brief sort of like overview of

our activities and what was on top for us. And yeah, Wafar will take that over, next meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. The reason I ask, is I received official confirmation from Bart two days ago that she had been named. So, mildly curious. I will point out though that although Bart notified us, and John Jeffrey, this is not an official position in the by laws, it was always essentially a courtesy position, so it's interesting that it seems to have evolved. In any case, anything else from Maureen? If not, do we have any other liaisons who want to say anything? You're no obliged to, and we have used up the time, but you're welcome to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, Cheryl, the only thing I wanted to mention is that the final agenda for the GNSO meeting on the 16th February is only come out earlier in my today. And I have not there have been a few phone calls going on instead, analyzed it, or posted it, or looked at it in great detail to see what may or may not affect the ALAC that I will alert on the list, if there is something.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I was curious to hear yesterday that on the Sunday they are breaking at 3:00 in the afternoon. And taking the rest of the afternoon off, I thought that was rather curious. In any case, let us go on to the next subject, and that is large review. Nothing going on there, we all know. Holly or Cheryl?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm happy to start, Cheryl and if you just want to fill in. First of all in the meeting we will be the working party, we had a meeting yesterday, we will be meeting every week up until Copenhagen, the idea is that from now until Copenhagen we as a working party and anybody else who is interested, in the ALAC community, to develop pretty close a final submission, so that when we get to Copenhagen, we've got a document that's pretty close to finalization because Copenhagen's probably going to be the last opportunity for a face to face meeting, before the submission's due.

That said, in terms of meetings, as I said, we the working party will be meeting once a week to develop that submission and in Copenhagen, as we had discussed, there will be a meeting Sunday, and that will be with the ITEMS team. It will be all of the ALAC community, and I say that deliberately, to be as large and encompassing as I can, will be invited to participate, it will be an open meeting, so clearly there can be spectators, but its aim is mainly for us to interact with ITEMS.

One item I forget, there will be a webinar, which is open to all, I think it's the last week in February, I haven't seen a confirmed date, but for anybody interested, that will be open to all as well. The second meeting in Copenhagen will be just for ALAC for the working party and all other interested community members to finalize details on the submission.

There will be a third meeting, it's not something we organized, it's something that the LARS and the SICT organize as a workshop open to everyone. That agenda was circulated yesterday, and it had a fairly

misleading title as a discussion on the powered membership model. I think all of us have made clear that that's a totally inappropriate title and that's been taken on board. It will not be called that, it will simply be called a workshop for ICANN generally to work with ICANN on discussing the review. The date after that will be the submission, the submission date for us, for ALAC to develop a submission.

Now, what all of us what we've discussed at the meeting yesterday, would be how we form the response, what I have done, was actually develop a list of topics that were raised by the review, in which we can put comments. It was made very clear that we also need to respond specifically to the recommendations.

So, what I am doing now, is putting all of the recommendations against the topic headings, and it's becoming a very interesting document, because it shows that for some items there are like four or five elements, couple of recommendations, a couple of implementation findings, all on the same topic. And obviously any answer should be developed around those four elements as one item. There are other areas where there is discussion in the review but there doesn't seem to be a recommendation or an implementation statement about it. But nevertheless, the issue is raised by the review, so that will be, I will be circulating that, an hour or so after this meeting, just as a kind of template so we can organize our thoughts.

And so that it will be very clear what the recommendations that they are proposing are and where they fit. And we can respond to them. There will be a very small leadership team meeting on Monday, and

then another meeting on Wednesday or Thursday Sydney time, and that will happen weekly just to develop.

So, there will be a Wiki, where everybody is most welcome and indeed I urge everyone to participate, but there will also be Google docs, and the reason for two is it provides a maximum opportunity for everyone in ALAC to read through the document and to develop the response, including, we want as much response as possible, so even though it'll be a little bit difficult coordinating what's on the Wiki and what's in Google docs, it was decided we have to ensure that there is a maximum opportunity for everyone to participate. Cheryl, have I left anything out?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, you've covered it pretty well, Holly. Cheryl for the record, excepting when you said everyone in ALAC, of course you meant everyone at large, but that's fine.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I do, sorry. Thank you. Any questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I happen to have my hand up. Cheryl just covered my third item, that you didn't mean that ALAC you meant at large.

HOLLY RAICHE: I do, I mean everybody.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two other brief ones, IDEC wasn't worried about the title of the session, I was worried about the fact that's what they wanted to talk about. That is, they wanted to sell the empowered membership model as opposed to review the whole report. And that I thought, what's the word? Taking out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Usurping perhaps?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that's not a word we would use for that. But a word very close to that, anyway, taking out that one aspect of the report and trying to sell the community clearly implying we didn't buy it and maybe they could get support somewhere else, I thought was highly inappropriate presenting the whole report, I think is quite reasonable and the norm. So, it wasn't so much the title it was the fact the title was accurate that I was worried about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, at least the title will be changed.

ALAN GREENBERG: I want to hear that the content has changed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, you and I are going to sit there and monitor it, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, now they're probably going to do it during something else that we have to be at, Heidi, is it against the ACSO Working Group reports? Or may it be against inappropriate use of the domain name system? For the latter.

HEIDI RAICHE: Yeah, there were two times of guests, the first being against that ACSO report, and the second one was they would remove the ATRT three meeting in its place for the at larger view. But they're still working on it and we'll let you know as soon as.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but what would it be against?

HEIDI RAICHE: Okay, give me one second to look at that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I was really worried that if they put it against the one on inappropriate use of the domain name system, that's a real conflict between the two, between us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I know, well, look, I think we just have to draw straws and make sure that one of us is there and I want to be at every single time they open their mouths, frankly.

ALAN GREENBERG: And given your job as co-chair that's appropriate but I think we need other input also, and it shouldn't be against something which is a very high interest at large, that's almost deliberately doing it behind our back.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, well, anyway, look, we'll deal with that I think.

HEIDI RAICHE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI RAICHE: Yes, so again, the first choice would be there will be a concept between the cross community session SOAC and PDP LAG updates, the other one it would be a concept between the cross community session towards effective DNS mitigation, prevention and response.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you make it clear to them that if they pick the latter, we have a major, major conflict?

HEIDI RAICHE: I will do that, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. All right. Any further comments on the review? It's going to be an interesting time, I see Olivier has his hand up, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Can you hear me correctly?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent thanks. I was wondering regarding the treatment of the public comment hearing, the public consultation, as far as I understand the input that the consultation will bring will go to the consultants and it's for the consultants to take it into account. I'm concerned the one particular point which is they might say if there is a single ALAC or at large response, they might say, "Well, that's the usual thing, we would expect it from at large" and they might brush this aside. Would it be worth asking our at large structures, who subscribe to the points that

we are making, to independently also send a comment so that we, because we've seen in the past, and it's just been very silly, saying, "Oh well, six people said yes in their comment, two people said no."

No matter how big or small the organization or the people are, whether they're individuals or whether they're just large organizations that are commenting, and then say, "Well, the ALAC said no, one person or two people said yes and therefore we're going to go with the majority, we're going to go with the yeses." So, in short, what I'm suggesting is that we get our ALSs to also respond to this review and to comment on this, or maybe comment on specific points. Is it worth doing this? Is it worth maybe even preparing bite sized ideas that our ALSs could comment on? I don't know, I'm just throwing an idea to you, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

May I give an opinion, Holly? There is a danger in a single response being treated as one response, regardless of who it comes from. On the other hand, if we encourage 50 ALSs then what's the expression when you try to get a write in, a campaign to contribute a form letter that says the same thing? There's an expression for it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cats herding is what I think.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, well, maybe that, there's something else. So I don't think there's any good way round that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think the term you're looking for, would it be filibustering?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, there's an expression, it was used during the dot gay discussions when 49 different organizations wrote the same letter, or close to the same letter. Anyway, it'll come back.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, Olivier, could I say first of all there are not only 12 recommendations there's equal number of things called implementation and there's a big discussion on the EMM. I think it's a big ask to ask anybody to come up with a response. I think at the very least, it's going to be a lot of work for everybody. I want everybody to contribute, now, we can put out ALAC the people can issue letters of support in what they are particularly supportive of, but it's going to be a big job just to get one thorough well reasoned response and the danger is if we ask for more, they'd be saying maybe the same thing, maybe not. Maybe going off in different directions, and I think that would also be a danger, so I hear what you're saying, but remember this is just their report, the consultant's report to the board.

We will have plenty of opportunity to work on our submission to expand on it so that by the time it goes to the board, we will have a lot to say. And we will have agreement on what it is that we say. And I think it's probably more important to convince the board and then

dealing with the structural improvements committee, working with them on implementing.

So, ITEMS is remember the West Lake report in many respects basically was just not followed. So there is plenty of precedent for a rejection of what is proposed. And what we need to do is make sure we have a cohesive and strong argument to say, "We don't think that will work here and by the way, we have much better models of achieving the same outcomes." But that's my opinion, look, I'm just so much aware of how much work it's going to take to come up with one really good submission.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. By the way, Yrjö did get the term, it's astro turfing, you can always trust a non-native English speaker to come up with the correct English words!

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

More than that, he's a journalist at heart, and he practices. Cheryl for the record, thank you very much. Look, I actually believe that at least making sure that our ALSs and individual members, through our RALOs have the opportunity to contribute, as Holly said. Advice important, I think any of them who have the time, then as well as inclination to put in individual and independent commentary should be encouraged, not discouraged. But I also think there's a reasonable opportunity for us to ask the at large structures and individual members and indeed the RALOs themselves, should they wish to be overtly listed as a signatory.

That's a rare thing, but I think that could be a powerful thing to do, it's something that did take influence when NCUC did it once. Unfortunately they listed so many people that some people like me, just went and checked on who they were and what activities they've ever had and that's also the problem.

But if we actually have real ALSs and real individuals it could be quite powerful. From that end, we also need to make sure that we do treat this, and as Holly was saying, there's plenty of other opportunity and I know Tijani supports a multi prong approach with us working on all the levels possible on this. And I support that, too. But I don't think we should take the importance of having a powerful response to this draft in public comment recorded.

My rationale there is, yes, the precedent is there, Holly as you outlined, but the whole thing about changing the way reviews happen and the whole thing about starting a new process now, on looking at standard operational procedures for reviews, is because they don't want to spend money on independent consultants and then ignore their advice.

So, it's not a done deal, we can't actually predict how the board and the structure improvements committee will response to the ITEMS report. It may very well be they take it hook, line and sinker and unless they're on the record, unless we're on the record then that's going to make our arguments rather more difficult indeed, then. Anyway, that's my thoughts, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you very much. Tijani, go ahead. Cannot hear you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. There are several points, first one we have still using the work party meeting list, to discuss our things about our response to the review. I ask that we create a list with only the working party members only, without ITEMS and the staff. Not all the staff, I mean and MSSI or SMMI, I don't know. I say that because we are trying to find how to contract, counter react the report that we find not beneficial for at large, for the community. We are not, there is no hard for anyone, but we have our reasons to make a strong response to this report, and this can be done among our members only, or our community only.

Yes, we have an interaction with ITEMS but we do it, and when we have the interaction with ITEMS we do it. But our own things should be done among us and I hope that this list is created very quickly, and that we use it for our exchange regarding our response. First point.

Second point, they are proposing a workshop in Copenhagen, and they want this workshop to be about the MM they are trying to send AMM, EMM, excuse me. And they right, it is their right, but we also have our right to be in this workshop, so that it will be more or less a balance. So I think we have to ask to be part of it, I mean, as they have a presentation, and we will have a presentation and we participate in the debate, so it will be balanced. It will not be, if you want, a campaign for the EMM, without response from us, or without an opportunity for us to develop our reasons. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. I will skip over me and go back to be afterwards.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I was going to suggest one thing, there are some parts of the report that particularly affect our at large structures and our RALOs. The EMM model being extremely high in that respect, and I wonder you know, if you read the report, it so highly critical of the ELT that it wants to abolish, that very discussion that we're having now to try and sound things off with the Chair, so the Chair doesn't just feel by themselves in having to make all decisions. The whole thing where they want to put RALO Chairs, in charge of policy as well at the same time, and of course the whole thing of putting the EMM model with those members that would effectively I guess, have the same sort of status as an at large structure. I mean, why don't the RALOs also each send in a statement regarding these issues?

Maybe we could, as a group, frame these issues, we could get each RALO to send a copy of that to and say you know, these are the points that we want to make. And so that then five voices rather than just one voice, to start with. And then, getting the at large structures to specifically reject the idea that individuals would have the same status as them and that there are checks and balances that an at large structure performs, which an individual doesn't. And the legitimacy of an at large structure being, I'd imagine, perhaps having a bigger depth than the legitimacy of an individual that has been around for just three months, not three weeks, three months.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we not discuss the content of the report, here, please?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I'm basically just saying we need to wage a campaign, Alan. This is not just a thing where one statement is going to do anything, and every battle counts, this is the art of war, this is Sun Tzu and we have to think about this quite strategically, that's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I wasn't arguing back, it's just let's not make this the diatribe against the specifics of the report. Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm just giving examples of the points that you know RALOs might wish to take up, that's all. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If I may summarize and we do have to move on, because we do have a packed agenda and we're very over time now. On one thing, on the presentation, I think we have made it clear, and hopefully successfully that it will not just be on the empowered membership model. If they want to present all aspects of the report, that is fine, and that is the norm for any sort of review of this sort, that there is a public presentation discussing it.

So I don't think that we can argue with that as long as it is going to be a discussion of the full report. In terms of the mailing list, I thought there was closure within the working party that we should have such a mailing list, but we haven't actually taken a formal decision. Holly, do you want to go ahead with Holly and Cheryl, do you want to go ahead with this? And I would suggest a mailing list that's composed of the working party at large members, the rest of the ALAC internal list, who are not otherwise on that list, and the at large support staff who are heavily involved in aspects of the report and in supporting the community in this way? Does that sound reasonable to you?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm happy to do that. Have a look at the chat, I've asked Ariel to do it, and she's doing it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's make sure that when we do it, we do it so that we don't have to redo it again. I will make sure that Ariel has the right list.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, she's doing it as we speak, actually.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that might be problematic.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, well, okay. Let's just say I have heard what was requested and the first request is per Tijani, ITEMS people and SIT people are not on it, it's just for the at large community.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I suggest we take this offline? Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Next item on the agenda, if there is nothing more on this item, is the report on the BMSPC.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, you didn't give me the floor that's why I didn't speak. Okay. The BMSPC as you know know we have the final slate of candidates. We started our work seriously, we made a consultation among the candidates and the community on the ways they want interaction to be. And we collected all the points of view, now we are implementing them. We put Wiki page for questions and answers and we will have a

teleconference on 14 of February at 13:00 UTC for the community to, for the candidates to make statements, to present themselves for maximum ten minutes, and then give the floor to the community to ask them questions. Whether they are follow up question of the questions sent on the Wiki, or they are new questions, or the same questions can be repeated, because the answers were not convincing or not clear.

So it will be a full interaction between the community and the candidates and we put for that two hours, I think it is more than enough. So, now we are there. There is during this period, there was a lot of issues raised, one of them is the petition, and how the RALOs decided support or not support the petition. And now there is also a discussion about the direction of the vote of the RALO Chair. Because in the rule of procedure it is written by vote. But they say after that according to their rules, so it was understood for the petition as being any kind of decision making in their rules and the RALOs used that, since most of the RALOs use the consultants' call and not vote. And now for the RALO Chair vote direction, some of our RALO Chairs are asking since it is written by vote, I think we have to have a consultation about this it is exactly the same as for the petition.

So, this is another point that we will have to clarify for the upcoming selections, and we have to modify the rules so that it will be very clear what we mean by this paragraph. So, now we will not discuss it again, since we are in progress and I hope that the interaction will work well and 21 February we will start the vote, the election. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Any further questions or comments? Seeing none, hearing none, next item is fiscal year 18, budget request. Leon, go ahead, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very Alan, thank you very much Tijani. Just a question, the voting will start on the 21st as far as I understand. But my question is for how many days will this voting will be open?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The vote will be open for seven days.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, you may want to consider slightly less than that, because if you need a second vote and you're supposed to have time in between the two, you really don't want it to run into when people are already traveling, so you might want to consider a slightly shorter vote to allow time between the two. Because otherwise we're running right into the travel time for Copenhagen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I understand very well, and I think that it was discussed this point, it was discussed inside the BMSPC, and we decided that it will be seven days because five days might be short because of the direction of the

vote of the RALO Chair. Since people wanted to the process of defining the person to whom the RALO wants, each RALO Chair to vote, can be during also before the starting of the election and during the first part of the election. So, this is why we decided to put I at seven days. If we put it for seven days, 21 plus seven, it will be 29, I will be 1st March. So, we will have if we want to have five days only for the second round, if we need a second round, or if we need to run it again, we will have I think time, before Copenhagen, we will have at least the first days of this period will be before traveling of our community.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, just remember you do have to allow time between re-consultation. Something we haven't done in the past, but the rules, I think, made that clear this time. Okay, thank you very much, it's good that you did consider it. And whatever the choice is, that's up to the BMSPC. Any other further questions? Then we'll go onto the next agenda item of the finance and budget just to be clear we are about 25 minutes behind schedule at this point. Finance and budget met this morning, the vast majority of the requests have been either finalized or sent back for very minor changes from the recipients and Heidi, are you comfortable that you have received them all in time to submit tomorrow?

HEIDI RAICHE:

Yes. This is Heidi, yes, I will start taking a look later today and then I will dedicate most of tomorrow towards them. Okay, and just a quick, if you're interested, Sandra has submitted one already to the controller

for the continuation of the chairing sales program for the ICANN Academy.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. There are 24 requests in total. Eight of them under the name of the ALAC and the other 16 spread over the RALOs. And a fair number of them are ones we don't expect to be funded but hope some of them will fund along the way. There is a 25th which might be submitted and that's a resubmission of the ability to use liaison travel funds at our discretion, where we never quite got an answer that matched both the text and intent. And Heidi is checking to see whether we have clarity on that, if we don't have clarity, we'll just resubmit it again. That's always a lot of fun to do. Any questions, comments? I know many of you are on the finance and budget and have already looked at these to more than you probably want to, but if there's any questions, or anything, then feel free. Give it moment for hands to pop up or voices to come out of the blue. And seeing nothing, we've just gotten back a bit of your time. Item eight is the ICANN58 at large schedule. And Gisella is not with us today, but I will turn it over to Heidi. I'll turn over to Leon, I'm sorry, Heidi's not listed as the speaker, so she's not allowed to speak.

HEIDI RAICHE:

Leon, over to you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much. So, we've been working closely with of course Gisella, Heidi, Alan and myself on the schedule for our meeting in Copenhagen and I think we're pretty much done with the scheduling. We do have a couple of slots that are not quite settled, already. But as you can see, we have on Friday we have the CCWG meeting. And I think that's the only two slots that are pending, if I do recall well are whether we're going to hold a meeting with the registries constituency I think, and our commercial stakeholder group. And that will be the two slots that we still haven't managed to confirm that we will be holding those meetings or not.

Other than that, you can see that we have a very packed schedule, we have been careful in taking care of not overlapping any meetings. And we have also been careful of providing with some wiggle room so that we can move from one room to another when we need to switch rooms. I see Heidi's hand is up. Heidi, would you want to speak?

HEIDI RAICHE: Yeah, I just have some comments that I have been directed by Gisella to relate to you, so should I go ahead and do that?

LEON SANCHEZ: Please do.

HEIDI RAICHE: So this is, I'm being asked to do this. Okay. She wanted to point out that there still the following modifications to be made or requested and that are not reflected on the schedule yet, and that is let' see on the

11th, Saturday 11th, 8:30-9:30 we have the cross community committee on accessibility and an amendment has been made, so Sunday 12th March, 17:00-18:30 we have the ALAC and CCNSO, the request to change from 17:00-18:00 as CCNSO are not able to extend until 18:30. Added, Wednesday 15th 12:30-13:30 an end users in ICANN a topical discussion with at large, and this is the RALO forum of capacity building. Olivier will be the moderator and she wanted to confirm, asked me to confirm, Tuesday 14th in the afternoon the ALAC work session part one and two, do you want that changed to ALAC and region leaders working session part nine and ten? Alan, Leon?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, reading out schedules to me does not make it. I'm afraid.

HEIDI RAICHE: Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: No way I followed everything you said.

HEIDI RAICHE: so basically, just so, in sum, there are some changes that are not reflected on that, what you're seeing on the AC and secondly, then for the ALAC work session part one and two do you want the titles changed to ALAC and regional leaders working session part nine and ten, to have that whole series? Because we're now naming them one through X, so do you want--

ALAN GREENBERG: Why was the renumbering started?

HEIDI RAICHE: You mean to part nine and ten or whatever?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, you're just saying should we rename something one and two to something nine and ten. Why was the numbering restarted?

HEIDI RAICHE: Well, in the past, the ALAC, way in the past, several meetings now, Tuesdays sessions used to be called work sessions. And now do you want to shift those to stay in line with what's happening all day Saturday and Sunday to working session, to ALAC and regional leaders working sessions?

ALAN GREENBERG: As far as I know, every ALAC session is an ALAC and regional leaders session. I don't think there are any ALAC exclusive ones.

HEIDI RAICHE: Yes, on Tuesday there were. So, I'm taking that to mean that you want them to be shifted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I don't believe we ever consciously excluded the regional leaders and told them to take the day off, but I may be wrong, but I do not believe we ever intended to do that.

HEIDI RAICHE: Correct, but the title indicated only ALAC, it's an ALAC working sessions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, well at one point we called it ALAC and regional leaders then we changed it to at large leadership and now we're changing it back. 'Cause that's confusing people.

HEIDI RAICHE: No, no, so basically just the Tuesday session, we're talking just the Tuesday sessions.

ALAN GREENBERG: They are a continuation of the weekend sessions.

HEIDI RAICHE: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're very welcome, the only exception is the wrap up session is called a wrap up session, because of share that deep in history and we're not going to change tradition. All right. Leon, I don't know if you were finished or not?

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, technically I'm done. I don't know if going through each of the sessions is the best use of everyone's time. But I can tell you that if you scroll through what we have in our screen, you'll see that there are practically no overlaps between any of the ALAC sessions and other working group sessions. Of course, we may have some overlaps for liaisons, for example GNSO, ccNSO we may have some sessions that might be overlap, but we're trying not to actually do the same mistake that we did on a previous scheduling. So, I think that this schedule is pretty neat. And we will be circulating the last version as soon as we have the last changes incorporated to this spreadsheet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, I'll point out there are critical and heavy overlaps between any of us within at large and who also happen to participate in GNSO PDPs. The schedule in their wisdom, now that we don't have any sessions outside of the window of ICANN, the fact is that if you're not GNSO, you are significantly disadvantaged and may not be able to participate or have to give up something from your native home. I find this exceedingly problematic for having open and fully participatory PDPs but that is the way that it has evolved. Two comments.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, I agree with you. Alan, I'm sorry I agree with you that's something that as you said, that's the way it is and there is little we can do to avoid that kind of overlapping.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And I had the discussion yesterday on a chair's meeting, some of you were there, and the Chair of the GNSO said, "Well, that's what we decided." And that really just says, we don't really care about you participating, sure you're allowed to, good luck trying. Cheryl I'll give the hand to you. I just want to note two things. Number one this schedule that you see in the board there, is really neat because of the color coding. I've never seen anything like that before, and the color coding is such that even if there are joint session it has both colors. I find this really easy to look at relationships and overlaps and things like that. That's point number one.

Point number two, I'll point you to one interesting conflict, you may recall during the discussion at the last meeting, there was a high interest topic that basically said legal counsel should defend themselves and how they interact with the board. That got changed to a John Jeffry question and answer session, which apparently worked out very well and they have now scheduled this year, this meeting, a question and answer session with ICANN senior executives. Unfortunately, they have scheduled it against everyone's wrap up session, which I find is rather poor planning. Cheryl, over to you and then Heidi.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan, Cheryl for the record. I just wanted to alert Leon and the team that to my knowledge, despite that the Chairs of GNSO may or not be saying, GNSO staff with the leadership of at least the subsequent procedures for new gTLDs working group are still settling with what we

may or may not have when and shifting things about trying to reduce internal clashes. So, the GNSO is far from settled on what goes when, but I can guarantee for some of us, cloning would have been a nice thing. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and Heidi you took your hand down, do you still want to speak?

HEIDI RAICHE: Please see your escape, basically I was just going to go onto the next but as you're the Chair, I will allow you to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I will let you do that.

HEIDI RAICHE: Well, okay, let's move on then. So basically, again, this is still not the final schedule. So, just wanted to point that out. So, the next thing we need to do then, obviously, is then start talking about the agenda. And as soon as this is finalized, we're going to put that up on to the Wiki page, our normal at large Wiki pages and we'll start populating the agendas. However, before we do that, we need to see what the results of the survey that was sent out a few weeks to see who you would like to see, so we're going to pass that over to Ariel, to take us through the results. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Heidi. Great, I was going to share my screen and Yeşim already put the result up, so thank you so much. And you can scroll this document on your own, and I will just do a quick overview of that. The first document you see is the speakers that must be invited and then the respective topics to discuss with these speakers. So, not surprisingly, the at large review related speakers are the most invited, almost everybody want them to be in the at large sessions. And then the next follow are the CCWG co chairs. And then, David Alis and next is GSC people, and Duncan Byres. So, these are the ones that have the highest scores.

HEIDI RAICHE: Ariel, can you just hold on? Can anyone see the display?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can see it.

HEIDI RAICHE: Really?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So can I.

ARIEL LIANG: You can maximize the screen.

HEIDI RAICHE: I'm not seeing anything.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, are you saying you cannot see it at all or it's not the letters are not legible?

HEIDI RAICHE: I'm seeing a grey blob.

ALAN GREENBERG: Log back onto Adobe Connect, it happens sometimes.

HEIDI RAICHE: Okay, fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, the questions I thought we asked questions about do you want things on the CCWG not to invite the co-chairs. I don't think that's quite the same thing, certainly we are going to have subsequent discussion on some of the work stream two issues. Is that really translate to inviting the co-chairs to have them speak to us? I can turn to one of the co-chairs? I hope we're going to have substantive content discussions, not hear a summary from somebody. No one else cares.

LEON SANCHEZ: I'm sorry, I got distracted for a bit. What was that, Alan, again?

ALAN GREENBERG: The item we seem to have asked is should we invite the co-chairs and there was pretty strong support for inviting the CCWG co-chairs. I thought the question we were asking is should we be discussing the CCWG, not inviting the co-chairs. I support the former, not necessarily the latter, although one of the co-chairs presumably will be there as part of the discussions.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, now I get it, I'm sorry, as I said, I got distracted by something.

ALAN GREENBERG: I mean, as important as co-chairs are.

LEON SANCHEZ: No, I believe that the invitation is of course well taken. I am not sure whether Matthew and Thomas will be available for this, I will surely be there, as you say. And I do agree with you that it would be best to discuss whatever we need to discuss on the CCWG rather than just inviting the co-chairs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. All right, David, Olive and policy, development contents. I look at this and I look back in the sessions where we have discussed overall update on policy and stuff like that. Those have either

not been well attended or responded with a lot of questions and things. So, I'm really curious at these answers. Maybe I'm the only one. Anyone have any thoughts? Do we want to blindly implement this, or do we want to think about how we really using our time? I'm a little bit concerned with how some of these answers, things have been answered. Yes, go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI RAICHE: Yes, so in the past David has come along with Sally Costerton and those have been interesting sessions, I believe. And I think that's what people are commenting on, in my view.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, that's not what the subitems say under his item, though. All right, we will take it under advisement and try to make something that works, given the overall time we have. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. I share your concern, Alan. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, we are 15 minutes from the end of this meeting. I don't know how many people can stay late, we have a number of really important issues to discuss. So, Heidi, can you take us through anything else that we need to regarding ICANN58, quickly? Heidi?

HEIDI RAICHE: Sorry, sorry. Just that's really all for me, I think, Alan, if we can start talking about the agendas, then we can present that on the next ALT, Olivier, you may wish to talk very briefly about the outreach plans from your RALO side that you're working on?

ALAN GREENBERG: If Olivier is still with us?

HEIDI RAICHE: So, okay, basically there are two items. One as I mentioned, Alan, is the EURALO plans for a topical session on policy, and that he is going to be having on Wednesday and the second point will be a plan for an EURALO NCUC event, I believe that's going to be on Saturday and that document and the plans are still being finalized. That's in sum.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much. Any further items on ICANN58? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, next item is the ALAC appointments. And I just want to tell you where we are on a number of these. On the auction proceeds we should have a recommendation for the ALAC, I hope within the next day. Tijani is taking charge of this for reasons I won't go into, and hopefully we will have consensus. I don't believe you've had any negative comments from anyone on the selection team, Tijani, is that correct? Maybe we've lost Tijani, too.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, no, no, I am here. Yes. I didn't receive any negative comment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, perhaps send them a 24 hour warning so we can do it, we really have to name the people before the next meeting and that's in two weeks. But we need to do that before then, for a number of reasons. We have a potential interesting situation in that Jonathan Robinson has said he will resign as soon as the GNSO can name a replacement co-chair. The issue is perceived conflict of interest in that his employer affiliates is one of the parties in the dispute over dot web, which is the source of 60% of the money we're talking about. And that is perceived as a potential conflict in my mind, it is no conflict whatsoever, but he is worried about optics and he has taken that action. I find that exceedingly unfortunate. Qing Chao is currently an interim chair and I'm not quite sure what the plans are for the CCNSO to name a permanent co-chair as you know, our opportunity for a co-chair disappeared and this is not nearly as solid ground as I hoped it would be at this point. I don't think there's any action we can take on the very short term.

On the dot NGO community council, we did have a number of applicants, the selection committee will be looking at them next week, deciding if we want to, which ones of the applicants, if any, or if all, that we want to forward to the PIR, that doesn't require intervention of the ALAC, because we decided that it would simply be the selection committee doing the triage. The final selection is done by the PIR nominating committee.

So, the RDS review is going forward. The appears to be, it might be a restricted scope or might not, we're not sure at this point. It's not really

positive situation. And the call has gone out for the ATRT3 and is open for another while. It looks like at this point, the CCWG members will be recommending that it be an abbreviated format. It's not clear exactly how we enforce that since the review team can make its own choices.

Unfortunately, again, before we know what the scope is, the call for volunteers has gone out by staff. It really shouldn't have gone out, until we know what the scope is, because we get the wrong people applying, but it's happened again for the third time. If I sound unhappy, it's because I am. I am not the only person to be unhappy. That's all I have to report at this point, any questions before we go on to the next item?

The next item is the one I brought up at our last meeting, that we are continually faced with things that are just not happening, they are not explicit action items, but they don't happen, the classic example right now is we reinvigorated, we thought, the gTLD working group, we have named co-chairs, we are no farther on than we were before. It's not the only thing. The staff for the last while have had in a project list, and Heidi has offered to open it up to the ALT to both look at and to add lines if necessary. It's on the screen right now. You have URL in the chat and we'll send it out via email also.

And people look at that, and do you think this will help? And if so, let's start using it if not, we need some other mechanism. We just can't afford to have things fall by the wayside, without even a conscious decision to let that happen. And I know everyone is overworked and overwhelmed, but it's an issue we have to do. I don't want to have to spend a lot more time talking about it right now. But do look at the project list and see if you think our types, or the other types of things

we're working on will fit well in that structure or we need to propose something else. Next item is staff announcement. Heidi, yours.

HEIDI RAICHE:

Yes. Thank you. So, if we could put this document into the display, so this is just to announce some staff changes. So there you see where we are, so we have gone from an A Team, and you know, you'll see that the past team will remain honorary members, but we are now going over to an A plus team. And wanted to let you know some changes, so basically, the key changes we have now have Nathalie and Terry moving over fully to the GNSO, to help support the huge hole in their support made present by Glenn soon to be retirement. Now, we do have some pluses coming in, we have Yeşim, who is now moved 100% over to at large. We have Evin, has now fully gained for training and she is already supporting meetings, etcetera. She is now for the most part 100% and there may be in the future that she would be reduced to 70% but I'm going to see what we can do about that, if Evin agrees.

And we also, Ariel is now going to be going from 100% for at large, over to 50%, now that 50% we are losing her is going over to Rob Hogard's team, the E3 team, where she will be working on communication, and other activities. But fortunately if there is desperate need for her technical skills, etcetera, we can bring her back for those projects. So, that's a good possibility there.

Now, we also have on the call for the first time, our new person, who is going to be with us only 15% for the time being and that is Mario Aleman, and he is on the call. Many of you may already know him from

his fantastic work with the fellows, he's already been working as a contractor for the SSAC and the RSER. So if we could just have him say hi, just very briefly? And he will be supporting calls post 18:00 UTC and on Fridays so you will start seeing him on the list and on the chats, starting tomorrow. So Mario, do you just want to say hi?

MARIO ALEMAN Yes, thank you, Heidi. Hi everyone, I'm very happy to be here and that I'll actually be joining you soon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, will you be in Copenhagen?

MARIO ALEMAN Yes, I will.

ALAN GREENBERG: Great, that was Alan speaking, by the way.

HEIDI RAICHE: So Alan, Mario will be in Copenhagen but he will not be working with that because we now have Evan full time there working with us, so we should be in full staff there. But he will be there and perhaps if he has time he can come and introduce himself to at large.

ALAN GREENBERG: That would be nice.

HEIDI RAICHE: Yes, so basically I will check --

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Heidi, I'll wait.

HEIDI RAICHE: I'll just finish and then I'll pass it over to you, and so then again we are currently, we were at the A team, we were at 5.15 FTEs and now given Evin's 100% we are at 5.65 FTEs. And I remain hopeful that that we may see some more. So, I just wanted to announce that to you and back over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. You can also invite Mario to any of our parties if we have any.

HEIDI RAICHE: Of course. I think he's been to them, but of course, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, but if we have an ALAC dinner or a staff dinner or something like that, then that would be nice.

HEIDI RAICHE: Yes, he is part of the team.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I've said this to you privately, but I'll say it publicly now, we have an occasion in the past had really good people and as soon as it's demonstrated that they're really good, they go off to the GAC or go off to the GNSO and it's a trend that I find discouraging, that's not to say all of our good people go off, we still have people who are really good here.

But we seem to be training ground for people sometimes and I hope that will not be the case with Evin and it was the case with Terry and Nathalie, we know, we slowly lost bits and pieces of her, til we lost all of her. It's really a discouraging thing that the ALAC is used for new people and then when they get good they go somewhere else. So, let's hope we don't see too much more of that. Tijani. I wasn't asking you to answer the question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. I am really, really sad to know that Ariel will be 50% only with us. I have worked with her in the previous selection, board selection board member selection, and also for the current one. And she's really, really, really, magnificent and superb collaborator, superb staff support, I really disagree that we accept that she is shared between us and another. I don't understand why.

Every time we have someone who is really performing, we lose it like this. Also Nathalie, who will be in charge of the ALSs in the future? And the ALS due diligence and application? She was, she knows very well the job, now she is gone we have to train another one to take the job,

so I want to express my sadness to see that Ariel leaving us. Not leaving us, but be shared between us and the others. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, and Heidi, I see your hand up, but let me say two things first. First of all, we do have some really good people who are still with us, and let's look at the 100% that we have in the top of the list. So, that's number one, number two I am plotting to figure out how we get Ariel back. So, let's leave that on hold, not make any more comments on that one, at the moment.

And lastly, having spent many, many years as a manager, you have to think about people's professional development, their careers also, and there are times when you give up someone and give them a good recommendation, although you would dearly love to keep them. Because that's what they want, or what's better for them, and I think we have to take that point of view, also. I've already made my nasty comment, that we don't want to train everyone then lose them, but the reality is sometimes that is exactly what you have to do. So, we have to balance all of these things. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI RAICHE:

Yeah, just along those lines, I mean, I fully agree that I hope my staff would agree that I am keen supporter of professional development and I do want to say that the new people are excellent, I'm thrilled to have Evin and Mario.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Heidi?

HEIDI RAICHE: Can you not hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can.

HEIDI RAICHE: Sorry, I've been saying wonderful things about my staff, I've been saying along with what you're saying, I'm a keen advocate of professional development but I'm also thrilled that we have new talent coming in and you can see already that they are top as well, and I'm not using A plus lightly. I truly do believe that we are going to go from strength to strength with these new, our new team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and I don't disagree which is why I was rather perturbed when I saw that reducing to 70%? Evin close your ears, 'cause we don't want to embarrass you, but it would be nice, oh she's not on the call any more apparently, not on Adobe Connect. So, I can't embarrass her but so far yes, we would not like to see that reduced to 70%. May I go on? However, we do have some hands up and we are very over time. Anything else on the staff issue? The next issue is an in camera item. I do not believe there is anyone in Adobe Connect and I can't verify on Adigo that is not part of the ALT or their advisors. Can I have

confirmation from that and if we could stop the recording and note the chat should be interrupted. And we'll go into an in camera session.

ARIEL LIANG: I'm confirming we can [inaudible]. Okay, we're up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, the ALT had a brief discussion regarding personnel on one of the review teams. And as is our practice when we're talking about individuals, we do not have those discussions in public. No decisions were made, thank you. Is there any other business? Seeing no hands, hearing nothing, thank you all for your attention and your input and it's been a good meeting albeit long. And we'll try next time to not have it run over. Thank you all. Bye-bye.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. [inaudible 01:30:55] rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]