
EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team ALT monthly call on Wednesday the 1st of March 2017, from 17:00 to 18:30 UTC.

Today we have with us Oliver Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, Alan Greenberg, Andrei Kolesnikov, and Leon Sanchez.

Apologies today we have, Julie, tentative, Julie Hammer is tentative. Maureen Hilyard and Holly Raiche as tentative as well.

Staff on the call today we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Yeşim Nazlar, and myself, Evin Erdoğan, and I'll also be managing today's call.

And just as a reminder, I would please ask you all to state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With this, I'll turn it back over to you Alan, please begin.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I welcome Andrei as our new ALAC ALT member. It's redundant. As our new ALAC Leadership Team member.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

Thank you very much.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're very welcome. Glad you're here. And we will immediately go into the first agenda item of policy review. Now, since we just had an ALAC meeting yesterday, a lot of this is going to be tentatively repetitive, so let's try to avoid, to the extent possible, repeating things that don't require actual action or discussion on the part of the ALT as we review all of these items.

Ariel, please.

Is Ariel with us?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: I don't see Ariel on the line quite yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: We will come back to this item later on then. Next item is any comments regarding reports from liaisons, or any comments of liaisons. I will note that we did have a substantive discussion yesterday on the issue of the evaluation process for IDN ccTLDs. We are going to be meeting with the ccNSO in Copenhagen, and we've been asked not to take any formal action prior to meeting with them.

We will also be meeting with the SSAC, at which I presume, the issue will come up. We were asked by Rinalia to put input to the Board, given that our previous advice has been cited as support for the ccNSO, and as you know, there has been some concern expressed that it is potentially at odds with the ccNSO, with the SSAC advice.

There is a new version of the evaluation process that supposedly takes into account the SSAC advice. I just received that yesterday. And I've not, excuse me, not yet looked at it. I will mention that I received a call from a GAC member who had heard we may be changing our advice, and was somewhat concerned.

The concern, it turns out, is not the general case, but someone who is concerned about a particular currently pending ccTLD, IDN ccTLD, and had concern that that one may be held up, as opposed to the more general case. So, I think we will have significant discussion of this in Hyderabad, in Hyderabad, in Copenhagen. I'm not sure we will come to a single position.

We may end up being split, but let's leave that for the moment and see how it unfolds. Any other comments related to liaisons?

Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we will go on to the next item of At-Large review. We have a meeting later today. I'm not sure there is to report today that is different from yesterday. Who would like to add anything?

There have been significant comments from a moderately small number of people, but a very large number of comments, and recommended edits on the document I have drafted. And I know Holly is working on an introduction that we had a long discussion the other day. And she still felt that there was a need to address issues by topic and not by resolution, recommendation, order, and we came to an agreement that the current section on introduction, which was just a couple of lines I tossed in as a holding, for a holding pattern, that she would draft the

first copy of that, which would address her concerns of looking at things that are more holistic point of view. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. I haven't spoken to Holly about this, and I didn't think it was appropriate during the ALAC call, but I have been keeping my powder dry on this idea of mine, for this call, for this meeting.

I've reached out to a couple of people who I'm hoping you will agree with me, will be able to bring in that last minute, fresh eyes, editorial aspects to try and ensure we have a suitably readable and homogeneous document at the end, rather than a patchwork quilt outcome. And so, for example, [inaudible] from AFRALO and Maureen from APRALO, obviously Olivier having held major pen holding on the RALO input, as well I would like to reach out and see if he would agree.

Olivier, as I'm poking at you now to make your life interesting. And again, Leon, because of taking sort of a legal drafting point of view. And I was hoping that if we can gather with you and Holly, Alan, towards the end of Copenhagen, and see if we could do a concerted push on a final polish.

I think it's really important to bring in some fresh eyes as well, and that's why I asked Sara if, Maureen, if people who are less invested on whether we're saying thee, thou, or [inaudible], can just go through with your, obviously [inaudible], and put in those final [inaudible] as an editorial process.

So, if you'd like to agree with that, I would like to see if we can [inaudible] that up, and obviously, I haven't spoken to either Leon or Olivier, they're hearing about this now. But you know, I just think it would be a really good idea if we could invest our effort, meaning that we'll have something quite [inaudible] polished and substantive, with all of the input that may happen during the Copenhagen meeting, put together in very short order.

Anyway, that's my proposal, and I would like to see if you all will rally behind and support that concept. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. Let me tell you, before we go that far because that's a step after what I was going to be talking about, and I see Tijani has his hand up. Are you commenting on what Cheryl said, or on something else, Tijani?

If it's Cheryl...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No, not on Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Then please go ahead briefly, and then we'll go back on that topic.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I think that it is important, very important, even crucial for us to have the feedback of our bases, of

our ALSes. As I promised last time, I wrote an email to the list, to the AFRALO list, asking them to read first the report, and then to give their points of view.

We also, at AFRALO, we decided to make our topic for the AFRALO ICANN meeting in Copenhagen about the At-Large review. This is obliged the AFRALO people to think about the question and to have at the end, the position from the region. And this is very important because we want to show those who say they are separated from our ALSes, that we don't represent their interest, that we don't interact with them.

We have to show them that our report, or our feedback, is also fed by those, based on those ALSes. So, for your information, the topic for AFRALO ICANN meeting would be the At-Large review, and we'll have our statement ready very, very soon. So, this would be, if we don't manage to have other contribution from ALSes separately, this would be the contribution of AFRALO about the report. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. I think it also is exceedingly important, that as you're drafting that, if there are things that are different, where you are differing from the overall At-Large position that we're pulling together, that you identify those earlier rather than later, try to resolve major differences in Copenhagen is going to be exceedingly different, difficult, just from a time point of view.

Back to Cheryl's idea, I have no problem with that. How we're actually going to carve out time to do that, I have a very significant problem

with. And I will give that challenge to Gisella to see if we can find some substantive amount of time that we can devote to it. What I was planning to do... As I said, at this point, there are a vast number of comments to the document.

Some of them, no doubt, substantive, some of them purely editorial. And what I was planning to do is freezing the Google Doc on Friday morning, and spending the day updating it, and posting a new version of it for any further comment, hopefully late on Friday or sometime on Saturday.

And that should give us a cleaner copy to start working with and go into Copenhagen. We're going to have to do a similar thing going into the Copenhagen meetings, and I'm not 100% sure what the timing will be to do that. But again, we're going to have to freeze it sometime probably late Monday, and again, have a clean copy to go out sometime around Tuesday.

But following that, if we can free up the time, I certainly have no problem with that. The more eyes we can get at it, the better. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, if I could just respond back. Thanks for that. I can work with Gisella now, and the individuals, and see what we can do. If you want to leave that for us, in my care and control with Gisella, and we'll pull out whatever miracles are possible.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's fine. I would suggest we probably want three hours?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would think that's about the right order of things, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now, it would be nice if it's before our wrap-up session. [CROSSTALK]
...really difficult.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That' might be stretching, but let's see what we can do, okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. In that case, we're going to need approval in principle. So again, this can't be an opportunity to introduce a lot of new concepts, because otherwise [CROSSTALK]...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...editorial is the concept here, editorial.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, I don't think you're disagreeing, I'm just making it clear to everyone that that's not going to be the time to introduce new stuff. We're going to have to have that wrapped up if we want to get ALAC approval in principle on the document.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Yes, Gisella, nights are long. My nights don't tend to be all that long, and the four or five hours sleep I do get, I would like to sort of preserve.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's see what we can do, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will leave it in your able hands. All right. Any further comments on the review? I note there is some interesting work going on, on the document that Olivier started for the RALO chairs. I did put a couple of comments on that yesterday. There was some errors in fact, which were, which I commented on, so hopefully that will be factored in.

Anything else? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices. Then the next item is ICANN 58 scheduling. I don't think there is a lot of difference from what we had yesterday and what was presented, but Gisella or Heidi.

Have we lost [CROSSTALK]...

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, it just takes forever to get unmuted. Sorry. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I strongly support people using local mutes on their phone, then you don't have to wait for the silly person to tell you you're unmuted.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, we do. Staff phones have an upgrade now and it takes a long time to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I love improvements.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Gisella, do you want to go over the main schedule, or should we just go ahead and review the schedule again?

You might be on mute, as well.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry about that. I'm on AC.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So Gisella, do you want to take people through the main schedule again? Any changes? Or should we just go through the agendas?

GISELLA GRUBER: I think, Heidi, if I may, Gisella here, if we could go to the agendas, as, sorry, I'm in editing mode on the agenda at the moment. The main schedule, everyone has got it. There are going to be conflicts. We've done our utmost best to make them, but there have also been a few last minute additions, and I hope that everyone, if there are any overlaps, that you're able to manage them with someone else.

But otherwise, I think, Heidi, that we can just go to the agendas.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. I'm going to just skip, because really, not a whole lot has changed from what we have talked about on the ALAC call. I do want to point out, I mean, I look over on the Wednesday, and let's take a look, because we are going to be sending our agendas into the, to be transcribed tomorrow.

So all meetings, all RALO meetings, all working groups that do not have agendas by tomorrow, will be given a very simple three-part agenda, and they will not be translated, and there will not be any changes, updated.

So, because we have been working with everyone for weeks, and you know, we've been... We appreciate it when you do send in the agenda, but time is running out. We have to move to our briefing documents now. Deadlines are, our deadlines internally... We do need to meet those. So, I think Alan, I'd rather just spend the time on doing the questions, if that's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, there is a couple of things before that. I understand yesterday a SSAC meeting was scheduled, and it was scheduled on top of what was going to be our work stream two discussion. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, no. I think basically, we had talked about that, it would be in the end, 30 minutes a piece, I believe. That was Sunday, right?

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, if I may. The SSAC schedule was actually... [Inaudible] pure volume of emails, I've been trying to keep an eye on the agendas, and my mistake if I didn't intervene earlier, but we've kept half an hour slot with the SSAC on Sunday afternoon. And then scrolling through the agendas, I saw that it actually was not where we initially placed it.

And that is a time that we've already set with the SSAC. So, it's possible we could keep it, because otherwise, we're going to run into the issue of not being able to meet with them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, not having it in front of me right now, how much time do we have, did we originally plan for the work stream two session, and how much time do we have now?

GISELLA GRUBER: The work stream two session was 90 minutes. It is now 60 minutes, with 30 minutes allocated to the SSAC. And as we discussed yesterday, I did off a 45 minute slot many weeks ago to the SSAC, and they said 30 was sufficient. So currently, it would be 15:15 to 15:45 with SSAC, and then 15:45 to 16:45 with the work stream two issues, bearing in mind that there is the transition break, so we can maybe five, 10 minutes into that, because we all need to be ready at 17:00 to welcome the ccNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And so, the question for this group is, is 50 minutes sufficient for the work stream two discussions? We had an hour and a half. There are going to be a number of issues that are going before the CCWG on Friday, that will eventually come to the ALAC as public discussions. You said 60, but there is always transition and moving around. So, we're not going to get quite the full 60.

So, Leon, Olivier, as responsible for the ICANN Evolution group, is 60, or 50 to 60 minutes going to be sufficient, or do we need to do some juggling. I know we're [CROSSTALK], we're predicting the unknown because we don't know exactly what's going to happen on Friday. I would like to hear from Olivier and Leon first.

And nobody wants to speak. Heidi, go ahead, speak while they're typing then.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, just really quickly. We do have a, on Tuesday, between 15:15 and 16:35, we do have an open session. Right now, it's just entered as policy discussion. So you could have a longer discussion there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, let's go into something else first. I don't recall seeing a meeting with Jamie Hedlund.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, we can add that.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have to.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I would also [CROSSTALK]...

We had not sent any of those invitation yet, because we have not confirmed things yet. We'll do so this week. So, Jamie, that's fine. When would you like to add him? [CROSSTALK] Okay. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: ...believe that at least a 30, preferably 45 minute slot time. Olivier, go ahead, and then Cheryl.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. You're asking for, whether we would need 60 or 90 minutes. Leon is saying, well, why can't we just have something that we can add to, so we input 60, but we prepared for 90.

I would say, look, have a 60, and then let's just try and see if somewhere we could have another 30 minutes that could be an add-on. It doesn't need to be immediately after the 60, but it's one of these optional things.

I don't know what the schedule looks like though.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's starting to get tight, and we also want to leave a bit of wiggle room for the At-Large review, if we ran over on that one. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record. I think Olivier is saying, he should stop picking on my brain, even long distance, of [inaudible] as the current schedule is going to be blamed for, and grab another bite or two if need be. Is a perfect one. Because of the nature of the work stream two work, of course we had the advantage of it being segmented.

So, you know, we can do a 15 here and a 15 there, if need be. But also, to take a little bit of pressure off, one of the more contentious issues, which is the matter of human rights, the human rights subgroup on its call this week, I think it was yesterday at some point in my time, got it so, how to do this politely?

Stood in sufficient stuff that its feet is stuck. That's as polite as I could get it at this hour of the day. So, we won't be pushing the home stretch quite so much as was originally planned in terms of having first slash second readings of documents during Copenhagen. So for example, things like the human rights discussion will be now planned for the Friday, for being much more a CCWG discussion.

And so, that I think, means that we probably we can make that plan achievable. And also, we have a couple of others that are going to be well advanced, and really are more likely to allow the ALAC to sort of

take them more a [inaudible] that we'll look more closely when we get to public comment.

The one that probably will take more time will be the jurisdiction argument. And again, out of today's call, unfortunately we're going to be less advanced in that conversation than we had planned to be, which is a shame for work stream two, but I think advantageous for your structure of timing on Copenhagen. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi, when do we have to submit the agendas for translation? [CROSSTALK] Some time tomorrow.

HEIDI ULLRICH: If we submit in the afternoon, we lose Thursday. It would be nice to finish them early in the morning, so we can send them about mid-day tomorrow.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Work with Gisella to find a slot for you and I to spend at least 30 minutes to review them in detail.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Can I just go over a couple of things or do you want to skip? Just a couple of things here.

ALAN GREENBERG: If there is something that you think the group needs to decide, yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just basically, I'll add Jamie Hedlund. Again, on Sunday, you said that you don't need 90 minutes with just Larissa and Lars, Rinalia is not able to make it. She can make lunch. So, it might be useful to just, perhaps the working party leadership to meet over lunch with Rinalia, if that's available. Gisella, I don't know if lunch on Sunday is available. But we can also maybe invite...

I think we do, should invite Xavier to talk about the fiscal year 18 budget as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Between the two, it's more important to get Jamie in, in his new position. See if you can get him for 45 minutes during that first slot then.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I will Xavier in on Tuesday then, because we do have an opening then, and I think it's pretty important.

ALAN GREENBERG: Put it in and we'll discuss it tomorrow. Any time after [CROSSTALK]... Pardon me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Later today...

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not likely to happen today. My schedule is almost complete full. And tomorrow, any time after 6 AM your time, when I'm not otherwise occupied, but there is only a couple of hours that are open, let's hope you are at the same time. All right. Next item, in terms of scheduling, what else do we want to look at? I think [CROSSTALK] questions for Board and such.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, go ahead. I believe.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. My apologies, [inaudible] to the ALT. Please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So, Evin if you can put the questions for the Board, the page in there, and you'll see it. Thank you, already have it, thank you. Okay. So, Alan, right now we have questions from the ALAC to the Board. This is actually, unfortunately, the wrong, this is Hyderabad. So go back and see if you can get it for ICANN 58.

Are you able to find that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel typed something in [CROSSTALK]...

HEIDI ULLRICH: I apologize if that was my fault, I had that missed... Yeah, another, yeah.

Okay. So we have several times now. Okay, so what we discussed in the ALAC, we have on work stream two issues, sorry. The ombudsman, vis a vis the complaints officer, so Alberto wish to have that mentioned, but Sébastien said that it was probably not the best place to raise it.

Then there was also one on the GNSO PDPs and At-Large. Alan, that was the issue you raised about scheduling.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And then Rinalia suggested that it might be useful to raise the issue of, to engage the Board on challenges of engaging end users.

ALAN GREENBERG: What form is that going to take?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think it's very similar to what we did in Hyderabad. Is that what you're asking? Like a big semi-circle, and then basically it's first, likely to be the first ALAC questions and then over to the Board questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. I'm asking on the engagement of the end users. What form is that likely to take? For us simply saying we have a hard time getting people to commit their time and energy to this, I'm not quite sure how that discussion will evolve, other than being told that's our job. Why are we asking them?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think it was raised in the context of the At-Large review. Some raised, should we raise the issue of the At-Large review at the time? It was thought, I think by the majority, no. And then Rinalia, I believe, suggested that in that context, that it might be more of a general way to introduce the issues that the review addresses.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Hopefully by then, we might have made some decisions on what we are doing, pending the review. So, yeah, we can try to introduce that. On the questions they're asking us, do we have anything to say? I'm asking the group. How much engagement from At-Large has there been in work stream two issues?

Well, there has been a lot of engagement from the small number of people who are very active. That's quite clear. How much engagement from the rest of At-Large? We brief people. There is not a lot of other activity. What help does ALAC need to complete the work? I don't even know how to answer that, other than ways that would be rude. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. What you might wish to do is explain the process by which we have our regular ICANN evolution calls, to brief everyone up. And I'm not sure many of the other SOs and ACs do that. I think some small groups sometimes do it, but it would certainly be good for us to showcase what we do.

And that everyone is welcome to join and to listen to what's going on. So, in the group itself, it's not quantity that matters, it's actually having that representative in there that will relate back to the communities. And it's not just a matter of counting heads in the room or in the virtual room. And I think that's something, it's a point to make quite clearly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree. Those are the two components. I'm not sure that's going to fill up an hour. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. I think that we can say that the At-Large community, that is a handful of people that are very active in the work stream two process. And I can see that, for example, for the African region, we have always discussed the work stream two [inaudible] meeting. Remember, our statement to the Board was always about it.

So, I think that the At-Large community is engaging in the work stream two work, and perhaps more than the other constituencies in ICANN. What we can do to make it better as they ask, I don't know. If they have the possibility to give more support to this community, to be more

participating in the process, yes. [Inaudible] be especially to translate all of the outputs, all of the [inaudible], all of the questionnaires to the language of the community, especially for Africa, at least, to French, and for the other regions to other languages.

So, I think what we can do to make the participation of the At-Large community better. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I have Cheryl next, but before that, on these kind of discussions, we really need staff to take some notes so what we capture what people are saying, otherwise it gets lost. So, could I please ask that after this meeting, go back to this section, listen to the transcript, or read from the transcript or the recording, and provide some notes to the ALT so that we can do some work and formulate what position we present to the Board.

I think it's really important to capture these ideas and not lose them. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record again. And my husband is snoring because he's been on the night shift, in the background, if you all want to identify which beasts in the household are snoring. It's not the dog at the moment, it's the husband.

Again, in support of Olivier, we must stop doing this Olivier, it looks like we're complicit with each other. I think pushing the, or advising, sorry, the Board about the ICANN evolution calls is extremely important. I

think that we also note that this is a continuity activity with what we did with work stream one, because they have a short-term memory issue usually, and will have forgotten what we've told them what we did with work stream one.

I think, if I can look at my crystal ball and maybe try and divine what it is the Board wants to get out of the answer to this question, it's some degree of assurance that rank and file within At-Large also engaged and having input onto what will be the At-Large advisory committee as a chartering organizations, responses and reactions to the outputs of work stream two, and I think we should be able to pitch that quite effectively.

The other thing, I think, if we point out, and obviously build on perhaps a few statistics where we can have, let me see, what are the regional activities may have gone in terms of updates, etc. We might be able to, you know, build out a few statistics there. Not hard core statistics, but just AFRALO focus, APRALO focus, EURALO focus, etc.

And I think we should probably note that we are aware, of course, that other parts of communities of chartering organizations, do have occasional, if not regular updates. The only other one that I am aware of, is the, somewhere between five week and six week a part non-commercial stakeholder group work stream two update calls.

They are very much the usual suspects, and predominately the leadership involved. And they are very much advise out to the people that are already presenting and leading the conversations within work stream two, are almost really briefing, as opposed to interacting and

getting information back, and they are particularly focused on, to put this politely, if we are going to say this sort of thing, one or two key areas of interest, in other words insert human rights and jurisdictions, as opposed to what we are ensuring, which is a view and review of all of the component parts.

So, I think there you could be saying quite effectively that when ALAC as a chartering organization comes to make its reactions to outputs, it should be able to rest assured that the majority of its broader view has been considered. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's an old hand. Sorry about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. We've got lots of ideas. If anyone has any new additional issues to raise with the Board, then please get them out very quickly. Heidi, next issue.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We then move on to the questions for the GAC. I think we can maybe pass on that. I don't know... I really, we need to work on the questions that you would like to address to Göran. Again, deadline is tomorrow. If I don't send the questions tomorrow, we will not be invited.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Does anyone have any questions for Göran?

Sounds like we're not inviting him. Cheryl, Olivier.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. This is... I mean, obviously we need to ask him questions. There was a question that was asked earlier, if you recall, and I'm trying to get my hand on it. It was a question to the Board, I think, and you answered in the ALAC call that this was not for the Board to answer, but it was for the CEO to answer.

And I think it had to do with the difference between the ombudsman and the chief complaints officer, if I recall correctly. Otherwise, failing this, you could just ask him the question, would you come down and see us? That's a tongue in cheek questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien made a very strong statement that we should not worrying about the issue of the complaints officer and the ombudsman until it goes through the work stream two discussion. I can support that.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. I support also not to discuss the terms of the ombudsman and the complaints officer, still the work stream two subgroup that make their work. But we can ask Göran about the complaints officer. Since this was an idea in Hyderabad, now it must be a protest, so we can ask him about how it will work, what is the process, what is the...?

To whom in the report, but is the, how to say? What is the complaint officer is about, exactly? We know more or less the idea, but we don't know the details. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're asking him to provide us additional thoughts on what this person will be doing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. If he already did some official process, what is it?

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Any other ideas? I see Cheryl supporting that.

Just one issue to raise with him? Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And this is going to be a far-fetched one, and possibly quite tricky to handle, so maybe we

don't, maybe we do want to raise this. And it's to do with ICANN fronting the GGD Summit, which it has funded in the past few years. And it seems that it is every year, so it's putting together the summit for the registries, registrars, contracted parties, to meet and to discuss all sorts of things.

And looking at the agenda of last year, this year's agenda is not available yet, but last year's agenda, it really started delving into marketing of domain names, and this sort of stuff. And I just wonder, on the one hand, we're being told that domain names is not about content, and ICANN should not start dealing with content, and on the other side, ICANN then spends money on marketing of domain names.

I just wonder whether this is in ICANN's mission, and I don't know whether it's something to raise with Göran, or a publicly, or whether this is really a hot potato. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I see Tijani's hand is up. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier, if we speak about that, why don't speak about the retreat that the [inaudible] had [inaudible] in US? I don't understand how this is working. Is it under the CROPP process? I don't think so. The CROPP is only for five slots, and it is in the same region. And the NTUC or NTIG are not [inaudible] region. So, [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I can address that to some extent. You may not like the answer. Those meetings are perhaps somewhat akin to General Assemblies or the summit. That is, they're an opportunity for people to get together, and talk about things. They were organized in perhaps in reaction to the GDD meetings that Olivier was talking about.

How they are funded, however, is a more interesting question. That in the past, they have been funded on a completely ad-hoc basis. They have not been part of the budget requests, and in that way, perhaps, they are similar to our General Assemblies, to our summit rather.

I'm told they are now... It is now working its way into the normal budget. The registrar stakeholder group, last year, raised the issue of, just how much is this costing? And had to submit a document disclosure request, because it was so private and secret, and that was the only way the numbers got it.

So, it is an interesting question one could ask, just how does this fit into the normal budgeting process. And you know, we won't say this in public, but how do we get our share? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Alan, don't say that it is similar to our summit, because our summit is done during an ICANN meeting, so people are travelling for the ICANN meeting and for the summit at the same time. They go to the ICANN meeting, and they go their gathering alone. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I meant similar in that it was funded out of band, and includes significant travel and other costs. That was my claim at similarity. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I'm concerned that we're mixing issues here, because... And I've noticed also Cheryl, not Cheryl, Heidi, sorry, mentioning travelling. It's not to do with travel, it's to do with ICANN organizing a pretty sizable conference. I can understand that it would organize a sizeable conference for supporting organizations, advisory committees for GNSO constituencies, but here, we are looking at something that goes further than that.

It's not a purely GNSO constituency thing. It seems to be the whole industry meeting up and using this as a space for exchanging tips on how to make more money with domain names. Just find it a bit bizarre that ICANN would be acting in such a way that might make it look like an industry association, rather than something which supports ICANN's communities. Thanks.

It is under GDD, it's not even ICANN, Global Domains Division, which somehow I have also another concern, because that seems to be somehow a bit more [inaudible] than everything else.

ALAN GREENBERG: GDD is part of ICANN. Cheryl, go right ahead and then I'll make a suggestion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very briefly, Alan. Cheryl for the record. You said a lot of what I was going to say, because I put my hand down, but then I put my hand back up again. I think it is probably a little hot potato issue. I think it will, unfortunately, drift into things like travel issues, and indeed, is likely to get a knee jerk reaction from the CEO, who of course, is sort of, as he should be, genetically prepositioned to be fiscal responsibility, and if in doubt, save money, I think we could also find ourselves at a time where we are going to be raising some issues in terms of support of our community, within the ALAC review process, likely to be kicking a hornet's nest because of a lack of understanding, not because of the [inaudible] of the questions to be raised.

But because of lack of understanding of why this would be raised and what discussions may ensue. I just think it's... This is a conversation that we have in corridors and along informal lines, rather than in this particular format before it comes to this particular format. And regarding the business units such as GDD.

We also need to be fairly careful that we see different approaches between different types of ICANN activities, may need to be taken. I don't think that's not unusual. And I would suggest that if we went down this particular rabbit hole, the risk would be more that if this is seen as an inappropriate activity in terms of, you know, exploration of marketing, etc.

Subjects of interest to the DNS industry, that the same criticism of being supported and engaged with subjects of interests of our community, such as Internet Governance Forum, would be equally doubtful. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A couple of comments. Number one, if we... Sorry. If we were to raise the issue of the [inaudible] directed parties, intercessional meetings, the only reaction that we would get is exactly the same one that was raised, that I got when I raised the issue of, why can't we manage travel funds properly? And that is carry costs between meetings, something that has been completely ignored.

And the answer was, he pointed out the day he would always be in the room, and say that is his department. So Göran may well be the CEO where the buck starts, but his reaction will always be, as far as I can tell, that if it is someone else's department, first deal with it there. And the intercessional meetings fall completely under David's domain. And that, I think, is all of the discussion that we would end up having in that meeting.

So, I would not raise that one. If we want to raise it with David and then follow-up it up afterwards, that's a different issue. I would think the same is true on the Global Domain Division. Not my department. Talk to the people in charge. Then if they don't get a right answer, obviously you can come to me. But to spring it on him at that point, I would not suggest that.

I would strongly advise against that. If we're going to raise issues with him, it has really got to be issues that he has responsibility for, or we have exhausted the other paths.

So, at this point, what do we have for him? We have the complaint officer. The GDD summit, I think, and the intercessional, I would suggest we do not want to raise with him as the first pass.

How about if we just put an item on, you know, interactive discussion with the ALAC? Or ALAC and regional leaders? Let other people raise the issues on the fly. I know he would like to have full briefing papers on everything, but I'm happy with that. If I may finish, Heidi.

I'm happy to say that this is an opportunity for the regional leaders, and the ALAC members who don't have interviews with him necessarily, and don't have a lot of contact, to raise questions and have his reaction. If that's out of the question that we can't do that, then I would, I have a problem with the process. Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

So, yeah, I like what Leon put in. How can the ALAC impact policy issues more notably? I mean, I think that would be a good question for him to answer. David Olive would also be there, so that might give David a chance to offer his suggestions as well. I also note that March will be the anniversary of the first ICANN meeting.

So, you know, you might wish to ask him about this first year of experience. But obviously, he very much likes the interactive format as well. So, what I'll do is I'll see if I can formulate some questions, in a briefing note, and Alan, I will work with you on that. And again, it does need to go in tomorrow. Okay?

ALAN GREENBERG:

There is one other issue that we can raise at that level. You may recall that there was a revised general registry agreement proposed a number of months ago, like about six, eight months ago. The ALAC didn't have a lot to comment on it, but among other things, we did comment that the wording related to single letter domains implied, didn't quite say, but implied that although the Board has said they're not allowed, you can ask for special permission.

The SSAC also made a very strong statement on that, as did the business constituency, and I think others. In December, just before Christmas, just before the holiday season, a new version of the document was issued. There was announcement, but it was an announcement at such a time that no one saw it, where ICANN basically took the vast number of comments that had been submitted, and basically said no to all of them, with one or two very, very minor wording changes.

And said, we're now going to go to the registries to approve this new agreement. And I find that process not particularly responsive to the community, and I wouldn't mind raising that issue.

Comments?

Is anyone still there?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah, I would take silence as agreement, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I didn't see a tick. All right. Are you happy if I...? Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. I was going to suggest another question, and that's another one to do with ICANN itself, ICANN the organization. We've seen through the first round, or the last round, of new gTLDs the growth in ICANN's staffing levels in specific departments that deal with the processing of such work.

Does Göran foresee any growth in any specific parts of ICANN and staffing levels when it comes down to policy, global stakeholder engagement, and GDD? Which I believe are probably the three main lines that we're looking at.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest that's going to be in the, what is now, I think, a very late operational plan. And I'm not sure we need to ask the question. I don't know what the status of the operational plan. Maybe somebody knows.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe that's a question to ask him as well, because he should be aware.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it's a question to ask Xavier. Do we have...? Did we agree that yes, the issue of the registry agreement should be raised? In which case, I'll try to come up with some words.

Yeah, I would suggest that the staff growth is an issue for the plan. And I don't know where it is. It should have been published already, I would have thought. Yrjö.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, this is Yrjö for the record. When Göran came to [inaudible], to the ICANN [foreign language], what he seemed to have quite upper most on his mind, was something called new narrative for ICANN. That is to say, how to explain what ICANN is doing to the outside world and so on and so forth.

I haven't heard about that ever since. I mean, if we run out of questions with him, we could ask whether he still thinks that a sort of new narrative of necessary and what it look like. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that was a hot topic which seems to have died, as far as I can tell. All right. I think we have enough things. We'll try to put together something quickly on it. Next item, Heidi. [CROSSTALK]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, again, we're inviting the GSE, Sally, and regional VPs, just so that we can give a little bit of guidance to these on what you would like to ask them. Or, would you basically like to hear an update, brief update,

from both GSE as well as the DPR team, including ICANN Learn, and just [inaudible] questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think a very, very brief, update, including what the blank is happening on the public, on defining or discussing the public interest. And then open to questions. But a very brief update.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, okay. And then, just finally, on the GAC. Gisella, I think you've been working on that? I think this is going to be by email. Was that the agreement Gisella?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's what we're...

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, Gisella here. There have already been a few suggestions, and I think Yrjö will be, he has put his hand up, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that is an old hand, but if not, Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, or the GAC. Just to be [inaudible], I said yesterday at the ALAC call, yeah, there are four items for the agenda of the meeting with the

GAC. But we're still waiting whether we have the preparatory call before the meeting. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we said we would not have a preparatory call. The last I saw, but there would just be email. All right. I think we're done with that section. [CROSSTALK]

Tijani, you have your hand up. We are running out of time at this point.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you very much, Alan. I think that we have a lot of comments and several of the work stream two topics. And I think that jurisdiction or diversity would be a good points to be discussed together. I know that we have very, very heavy involvement in those two topics and perhaps in others. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Are you suggesting we discuss that with GSC?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No, Alan, with I propose to discuss such with the GAC.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Oh, with the GAC. Sure. We can try to add it. Yrjö, please take note. We can see if they have an interest in raising that in a public meeting.

All right. Heidi, you had a very...

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi, you had a very brief update on the budget, and then we'll go back to Ariel on policy issues.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Unfortunately, unless you can do that right now, because she has to leave the call. So Ariel, can you handle that right now?

ARIEL LIANG: There are no updates to policy, it's the same as yesterday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I do have an issue on policy. I received a message from somebody who I don't remember, someone whose name I've never heard before, Jared Irwin, who apparently is on the ICANN Board advice team, whatever that is.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, he handles the Board advisory, the BAR, registry [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: And I received a copy of the current Board registry ALAC issues, and in it, seems to be almost all, but not quite every statement we have issued

for any purpose last year. So, somehow, someone has decided that going back four years, everything we say is Board advice. And I'm really confused what is happening. [CROSSTALK]

Yes, I will do that. Because we have the most mundane things that we are now getting comments from the Board. This is what we think you mean, is this what you meant? And the last thing I wanted Board members to be looking at, but curiously, some things that are relevant to the Board, haven't seem to go beyond the advice register.

So, not quite good. Okay, thank you. We have no new issues other than what was talked about yesterday. Thank you Ariel. On to finance and budget.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah. Thank you, Alan. So, I sent basically, all day yesterday, and I will spend most of my day today, going over the, some of the, most of the At-Large review requests. We made good progress. I think that there is good progress being made on a lot of them. They were being, I think, really creative.

But I will be speaking to some of you in Copenhagen, and I think we do need to have, that's another reason why I wish to have Xavier there, to talk about the fiscal year 18 budget as well. So, I think, you know, I will let Alan and Xavier know what sort of details to raise there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't believe we allocated any real time to discuss the budget requests in Copenhagen.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, that's why, again, we put him in on Tuesday.

ALAN GREENBERG: This meeting seems to be getting out of hand. All right. Next issue on the agenda is the review of the ALAC meeting. I don't think there is anything we haven't discussed already that needs to be raised. Is there anyone that has something?

Evin has posted the action items, but I don't hear anyone saying anything. I will assume there is nothing we need to discuss on this meeting. Any other business?

Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Alan. Sorry if I missed it, but with regards to the ALT meeting on Friday the 17th in Copenhagen, I don't think you addressed this, did you?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I didn't address it, I'm sorry. There was... [CROSSTALK]

Sorry, I'm working off of a paper schedule which is printed before the changes. I forgot them, sorry.

GISELLA GRUBER: Not a problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Number one, there is an ALT dinner for people who can attend, it is not mandatory, but we would like to know, as Gisella would like to know, as soon as possible, who would be attending. It will be held probably in the hotel at 8:00 on the Saturday, the first day of the meeting.

So, anyone, if you could please, I don't remember if Gisella has sent out a formal save the date or call for responses, but we need to know, moderately soon, who will be attending that. That's number one. Number two...

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, just if I may, I've got to jump over to the AFRALO call. With regards to the Saturday ALT dinner, you did initially receive not for [inaudible] because he wasn't on the list yet, the save the date for the Friday the 10th. Then I sent a Doodle poll, just in case you're wondering why I'm doing it again and had you not noticed the change of date, we are now having it on Saturday the 11th.

So the Doodle poll was a yes or a no if you could attend. I know the chair was not able to attend, but I will just send you a little reminder, if you could just let me know for those who haven't yet responded. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And to be clear, it is not on Friday, it is on Saturday. The ALT meeting that is scheduled for Saturday, sorry, for Friday at the end of the ICANN meeting, can we have a summary, right now, from Heidi or Gisella of who is able to attend? I know Andrei is not, because he already had a prior business engagement.

As of yesterday, both Leon and Tijani were scheduled to leave early in the morning. Has that been corrected?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. So, I believe, I know that Tijani's flight is looking to be changed, so he can stay for that. I believe Leon's flight is as well. So, we will hopefully have an update on those two later today.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I presume, Tijani will not be charged a change fee for this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And if I could just add, if we could please have an agenda for that, because we are going to be putting this up on a restricted page. And just to confirm, Gisella, I already know that we have [inaudible] is that correct?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, correct, hence the meeting is starting at 8:30 morning in the morning, because Steve will be with us from 8:45 to 9:15. So, starting at 8:30 allows us all to actually get there and be on time. Please do have breakfast at the hotel, it is included in the room rate. And we will be serving a mid-morning snack with coffee.

ALAN GREENBERG: For clarity, this is not a breakfast meeting. You are to have breakfast, if you want to have breakfast, before arriving at the meeting. And it will run through, at this point, until 12 Noon, three and a half hours total, because based on what I now understand everyone who is attending the meeting will be able to stay until then.

And yes, Andrei, we understand you already had a prior commitment. Are we done with this? So, there will be a meeting held 8:30 until 12 Noon on Friday. Now that I know the meeting will actually happen, there will be people at it, I will try to put together an agenda.

Anything else under any other business now?

Andrei, will the meeting be online? It will not be online. This is going to be after all of the facilities are taken down, and we'll just be meeting in a hotel room.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, okay, all right. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the conditions of being able to hold this meeting is that we not require any facilities.

All right, we will talk to you beforehand and let you have an opportunity to provide input or whatever. If there are no other issues, then I'll call this meeting to an end. Thank you all for attending.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]