YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC leadership team mid-monthly call, taking place on Thursday, 13th of April, at 17:30 UTC. On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Andrei Kolesnikov, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, Maureen Hilyard, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and Glenn McKnight.

We have received apologies from Holly Raiche, Silvia Vivanco and Mario Aleman. And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber, Evin Erdoğdu and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. So 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, and it is Alan Greenberg speaking. Are there any comments or suggestions for changes on the agenda or for any other business? Seeing none, hearing none, we'll accept it as distributed and go on to the first item. The first item is policy development. There are a large number of either new comments, or comments that we need to decide on, and some of which are not in great shape in terms of timing. So I'll turn it over, first to Ariel, for identification of the first one that needs discussing.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Alan. This is Ariel speaking. The first one we need to discuss is the recommendations to improve ICANN's transparency, and in fact,

that public comment already closed. But I contacted staff support, and they said they can wait 'till the end of this week. He said ALAC has had to submit any statement.   And I know there's one member from LACRALO volunteered to be a assistant drafter for a brief statement, but he doesn't want to be the main pen holder. So we're a little stuck there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I did volunteer on a call with Ariel yesterday to take the lead, but it's going to be a very, very sparse lead, unless someone else has any input into this process.   Anyone have any thoughts on it? Particularly anyone who might have been following the discussion? And I look to both León and Cheryl to provide any input you might have. Is it something we can just pass on and say fine, the group is doing its job, we have no real comments? It is not an issue that we have tended to be very vocal about, although we have said we expect ICANN to be transparent, we have not focused on the specifics ourself. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl, for the record. I think we can actually get away with a yay team, and why this very important issue is good to see being progressed so far to date. And as a firm believer in both accountability and transparency, how important we believe that ICANN undertakes a continuous improvement program, related to its transparency issues. That type of, you know, (inaudible) is probably enough. As you know, I've served on

this committee, along with every other bloody one, and to that end, I'm personally quite happy with where the document is.

There are a couple of crossover points with other activities, such as Ombuds office that, yes, we could raise some issues on or concerns or questions. But they're probably going to be picked up in the other work team activity such as other Ombuds office projects work group. So I'm concerned about the time, I think we can get away with something supportive and not too deep and meaningful. It's also not the last bite of the cherry on this, obviously we can come back to it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. So, number one, I'll note it is now six minutes past the official start of the meeting. I'm not quite sure how many minutes past the start of the recording. Could I ask staff to review the recording as soon as its made available from Adigo and transcribe what Cheryl said, so we have a draft for that statement. That being said, and that's an action item. That being said, part of me recalls that there was a discussion, and I think I remember how it ended, but I'm not 100% sure on whether what we are requesting is potentially a very expensive and possibly onerous task.

At least some aspects of the information disclosure and making things available. Cheryl or León, do you have any recollection, is that actually in the document now? My recollection is yes, it may be expensive but tough, that's what's needed if we're going to be transparent. I do have some worries about putting responsibilities on the organization which may load it down heavily. Thank you. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That was a fresh hand when you asked that question, Alan, so I'll take that if you like. Mainly because I'd like León to keep breathing, and he's on his nebulizer. Funny about that, I just think it's good if he can keep breathing. Yes, you're correct. Yes, there may be issues. I'm also of the tough shit, back it up school of thought. Sorry. Transparency may be more expensive than you believe, but it's far too important to this organization to be done on the cheap or not done at all anyway.

But, it also is not the last bite of the cherry, that can be discussed. Implementation of recommendations from work stream two will still be discussed and separately dealt with. There will be implementation teams, and most importantly, a – God, I've just had a mental blank on the name. There's a review that the Board does on all of our recommendations as well. An impact statement. An impact analysis is done. So that is another opportunity for those things to be more detailed and gone into.

ALAN GREENBERG: So in other words, if I put a statement in which says we do have some concerns and ICANN will have to focus on the potential costs as the implementation is designed, you would not object? She says, check mark. Alright. Any other further comments on this? I see no hands and time is fleeting. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Alan. The next one is on the internationalized domain name implementation guidelines, and our deadline is next Monday. I know that (inaudible) sent an email to their large worldwide mailing list and asked for volunteers to review the public comments or submit comments, but I didn't hear much traction on that topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. That's one that I would not cry too much if we simply passed it by. Anyone else have comments? Andrei, go ahead.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Yeah, it's Andrei. I could do a short review just to see what's up to date in this review as something caught my attention with ALAC, okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. Given the timeframe, you know, if it's just a yeah, go ahead, go ahead, that sounds right, I would pass on a comment unless we really note something that's gone awry. But yes, please, if you could volunteer and get back, we would appreciate that. Cheryl, is that a new hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm afraid it is, Alan. Cheryl for the record. Happy with that Andrei, but also remember, whilst it says it's an interim paper, it's an interim paper which is put out by a group that recognizes it can go no further with its primary aim of looking at some harmonization. And in fact, the group has broken up. It's not intending to meet again or continue its work,

and this work will be subsumed by the GNSO subsequent procedures on new gTLD's. So, it's just slightly different than some other pop it back from PC, get a reaction, get a response and then make changes. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Noted. No further comments? Then we'll expect an answer back from Andrei, and to be honest, I'll hope it says, it's not so bad, we don't have to comment. But Andrei may surprise us. Next, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Alan. The next one is a interim paper cross-community working group on use of names of countries and territories as top level domains. And I know Maureen and (inaudible) have both reviewed at public comment and Maureen just sent an email to the ALAC list and stating that ALAC probably will issue a brief statement supporting that interim paper.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Maureen, are you in a position to comment? I very briefly read some of the stuff you wrote, and your comments seemed to be – the recommendations of the report, which I admit I haven't read yet, seemed to basically say they're either deadlocked or there's not a lot of progress they can make. And you were saying that's correct. They are not recommending anything which is likely to be controversial because they could not come to closure on the more controversial issues. Did I get that right from my very brief reading?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Basically, Alan, thank you, this is Maureen for the record. Thanks. I just think we could make a very brief statement saying that we support – well, the first recommendation that they all agreed on, and the fact that they do need to do more work, that the issue needs more work. But because this particular group could not agree on anything, apparently, you know, they just felt it was time for them to disband and another group taking over.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, to be honest – I don't know where that noise is coming from, if staff can try to find it. I was rather surprised, I presumed that the report was actually making recommendations, and I was rather surprised they could come to closure on any of these issues. So at some level I'm relieved, in fact, they're not making specific recommendations, because I had some difficulty believing they could, in fact, be accepted by the whole community. So good luck to the next group. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just that everything I said with relationship to Andrei putting something together for what is accountability sub-group question, is relevant to this topic, not the one I just spoke on. So just ignore what I said last time, insert it into this piece. And I'm typing my response to the other one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Not the first time that's been done on this call. Usually I'm the guilty one. Alright then, please, everyone take a look at

that, we're again up to deadline on this. And although it doesn't sound like what Maureen is talking about is controversial, we will put it out to the ALAC, but we really do need to make sure that we're all comfortable. This, it turns out, is a really important issue, and we want to make sure that anything we say is something that we're doing to defend, going forward. Although it doesn't sound like we're saying anything particularly controversial. Next, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Alan. Next there's the competition consumer success and consumer choice review team draft report of recommendations for new gTLD's. Holly has drafted a first draft statement, and it's open for comment until next Tuesday. And I invite all of you to take a look at it, it's on the wiki. And I'll put the link in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: This, again, is one that is rather important. So everyone, certainly in this group, really needs to read it and either put a very brief comment saying you support what it's saying, or disagree and suggest what it should be saying instead. We've put an awful lot of work into it through our members, and a number of us have put significant parts of our life into it for the last couple of years on the new gTLD program, so it's really important that we put a salient statement in. And at least part of what the recommendations are saying, is that ICANN needs to put a lot of work into this.

And I think we need to make a very strong statement saying we support that. That is, we need studies, we need real data if we're going to move

forward on this. And I would suggest that if you recall the letter from the registries advising ICANN what to do with parts of the $86 million it's holding in reserve for the new gTLD program, and I would think a statement saying use of that funds to help fund the studies which we need, would be a really strong benefit to going forward and making sure we have data as we go forward. Comments on this one. None. Is Olivier not on this call? Because Olivier normally has thoughts on this particular subject. He's not, apparently. Cheryl, go ahead.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Alan. Sorry for interrupting, but Olivier's on the call but he will be joining us in the AC in a while, but he's on the phone list.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, if he has anything to say he can yell out. Cheryl, go ahead first.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. First of all, Cheryl for the record. And I do agree with everything you've said. And none of the major things that we could say, on a light touch approach to this response, recognizing again, that this is not the absolute end-game on this, is that we do bemoan the fact that so much of the early work on metrics was not heeded. And that therefore, a number of measurables are not in place to make this group's work as effective as it should have been. And that their calls for ongoing and serious commitment to the collection of such data is important and should be heeded. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other further comments? So, please read what Holly has drafted. Read the report if you haven't read it yet, or at least the summary of it and go back. Cheryl, your comment to Andrei is on -- I don't understand it. The removal –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My comment to Andrei is what I said I would type related to responses to accountability work stream two.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but I think he volunteered on something related to IDN guidelines.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You then skipped that accountability work --

ALAN GREENBERG: We may well have.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And the transparency. I mean, I'm listening to what was said, not reading the microscopic screen. And if you sounded off Ariel discussing accountability subgroups regarding accountability, which is the one I Chair, that is not what we discussed. We discussed transparency, which I believe the record will show, is what was introduced. And to that end, my comments on transparency are still relevant. But to accountability, what's relevant is what I've typed.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I don't think we discussed that, at least I didn't, and Andrei agrees that what he volunteered for was related to IDN. So we do need – I presume Ariel will cover the AC/SO accountability in due time. I'm not quite sure the order she's doing these in. Back to you Ariel, however.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. We haven't touched that one, I will do that last. The next one is the FY18 operating plan and budget, and five-year operating plan update. Tijani volunteered to draft a statement on that and the public comment is going to end the end of this month, so I'm not sure whether Tijani has any update to share with the group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we just had a call on finance and budget. We have given him his marching orders on that group, and the items which will be included, aside from anything he finds on his careful reading of the budget, will be requests for funding for the GAC liaison funding for potentially five new travel slots for use by workers. That is in lieu of what the At Large review is requesting. And noting that the – sorry, my mind has just gone blank.

The transcription of meetings is being moved into the ICANN budget, and we suspect they should be increasing it now that it's no longer just At Large. And request that the CROPP program be funded as base budget instead of still being a pilot. There may have been something else I've forgotten, but I think that those are the major items. Tijani, did

I miss anything that needs to be noted here? I guess not. Tijani says no. Or he says yes, I didn't miss anything.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: You got it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, you didn't miss anything.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm just commenting on the fact that check mark normally means yes, not no. But I think we understand each other. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Alan, I think. Sorry, I saw some hand raised, so I just lowered it. And then the next one is on the GNSO community comment to our new gTLD subsequent procedures TDP. Both Alan and Cheryl have volunteered to draft a statement on that, and the deadline is May the 1st.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can't remember volunteering to do that, but I suppose we did.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nor do I, but anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's because we're foolish enough to be on the working group and no one else is paying attention. Or something like that. I guess we need to look at it sometime. Please remind us if we haven't done anything a week from now.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Next is the draft 2016 applicant domain name system market study, and Wafa and Sean have volunteered to review that public comment and will recommend to the ALAC whether a statement is necessary. The deadline is May the 5th, so I can follow up with them next week and see whether they have any update.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Next.

ARIEL LIANG: Next is a new public comment. It's on the proposed fundamental bylaw changes to move the Board governance committee's reconsideration process responsibilities to another Board committee. And that one will end May the 10th, and I'm going to put the link in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. León sent out a message on that one saying he thinks it's very important for us to comment. A variety of other people

have said it's very important to use this as a model for testing how the empowered community can act. I'll remind you that the approval of fundamental bylaws is the only case where the empowered community must act to do something.

In all other cases, the empowered community acts to initiate something, either reject something or move someone or some action like that. This one, they must actually act in order for the bylaws to change. And there is a general agreement that this is an innocuous change, and it is a good exercise, and I cannot disagree with that at all. And that process of the empowered community will follow the comment period.

My question is, and I asked it on the list and I'm not sure I was satisfied, but I don't need to be satisfied. Why this is something that we must comment on.   Now, for those who have not followed this, this essentially takes the responsibility for reviews and takes it away from the Board governance committee, and puts it into something else so that the Board governance committee can – sorry, not reviews, IRP's and review processes away from the Board governance committee so the Board governance committee can focus on Board governance issues.

As far as I'm concerned, since the community has no say whatsoever in who goes on what committee, it is a completely arbitrary change that doesn't affect us at all. It happens to be in the bylaws, and therefore we do have to take action to change it, but I see no impact and no ability to control -- the Board could take this new committee and put whoever they want on it for the next go-round. So I don't see any need for

commenting, but León did think we should comment, and his hand is up, so I'll let him speak.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Alan. This is León. My comment goes to actually trying to flesh out a little bit more the charter, the new charter of this new Board committee. As I said, I totally agree with you that this is out of our control as to how the Board manages to assign work to the different committees, and of course it's not up to us to designate anyone to the committees.

But as I said on the email threads, I believe that charter, as it is published now, shows us very little of what the scope of this new sub-committee would be. So it might not be up to us, again, to define the charter of the sub-committee, but I think that commenting on it, I'm trying to put it on a way that actually serves the purpose of its creation. It could be helpful, and it could also be a good exercise for us, being the first time that the empowered community actually is asked to deliver on something. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I presume you are willing to draft such a comment?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, of course. You can count on that. I can draft something and I will send it back to us so we can all provide our input.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Ariel, you have a volunteer.

ARIEL LIANG: And I'm recording him.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're back on your nebulizer now. Next item, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: The next one is deferral of country code names supporting organization review. And that new end will end on 19th of May. I did contact Maureen and she says she can do a review of that and make recommendations to the ALAC whether a statement is necessary.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll draft a statement right now. Thank you, Board, for a touch of sanity. But Maureen may have something additional to say. I would like to comment on this and point out that yes, this would be a wise move, especially since we seem to be in the midst of changing how we do reviews. Initiating one while we're still trying to figure out how to do them is probably not wisest of move. Next, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: The next and last one –

ALAN GREENBERG: Can't be the last one because we have the one Cheryl was talking about.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, that's the last one. And it's on the ALAC response to the CTWG
                        accountability work stream two SO/AC accountability sub-group
                        questions regarding SO/AC accountability. So, I know, Alan, you have
                        drafted a statement –

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

ARIEL LIANG: In process – finalizing it?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're talking about the wrong statement. That's something which
                        actually was finalized a while ago, and just was never dropped off of the
                        list. You're talking about the first bullet point under 'B'.

ARIEL LIANG: Right. That's right.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're talking about a new public comment that has opened.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. I'm just checking the public comment page, I may have missed it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or at least it was supposed to have opened, I haven't checked to see if it's there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It should have been opened yesterday. It should have been opened yesterday, I would have hoped. If it's not, then, grrr. But regardless, you just take note of that irrelevant intervention I made in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: It wasn't irrelevant, we just didn't know what it was for then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was pretty irrelevant at the time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Recently opened. It has not officially opened yet. The most recent one is the 6th of April. So it's not there yet. But it will be there soon. And now we have to go look at what Cheryl's comment was. Noting the fact that things are well underway, but the question is – what was a mutual accountability form, is no longer a mutual accountability form, and do we want to comment on that?

My comment, which I've made in a number of forums, is I strongly supported it, but given how things have unfolded in the At Large review, ICANN is not really ready for that yet. To talk impassionately about each other's accountability, is probably not where we are. So we can

certainly make a comment about that. I don't feel a strong need to make a lot of other comments on that. We probably want a, you know, keep up the good work. Other than that.

And we'll find a sucker to write that, which probably means me or Cheryl. Any other comments on questions? We're way over time, but we did have a lot of these that we had to go over. Last call on policy statements. On to agenda item number four. Any comments from liaisons? Julie Hammer, go right ahead. Thank you for joining us, by the way.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Alan. I'm probably a bit silly, but I am still awake. I just wanted to mention a couple of things that are happening in (inaudible). You'll remember that because I wasn't a member of IDN harmonization work party, that I wasn't aware of the imminent issue back some months ago of SAC084, which made the comment on the extended process similarity review panel that the ccNSO was proposing. And that ended up causing all of the difficulties, both between SSAC ccNSO and ALAC.

Subsequently, I've joined that work party to try and keep an eye on what's happening within it, it's actually planning to produce a number of advisories on IDN issues, and I just wanted to highlight that the next one that is in the process of, or getting towards the end-stage, it'll still be a little while before it comes out, is one making a comment on emoji's in domain names. And basically saying emoji's are a bad thing, and the degree of badness depends on what level in the domain name we're looking at. But is it bad at all. Also, I just wanted to bring that to

your attention, that that's going to be the next process about (inaudible) from that particular work party.

But the second thing that I just wanted to mention is the SSAC (inaudible) the ccNSO has been offered the opportunity to defer its organizational review, and it hasn't yet made a final decision, but that may well be made during the meeting that they're moving that will follow this one. The SSAC monthly meeting. But my feeling at the moment is that the SSAC is going to decide not to defer the review. That's it. Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was rather surprised when I heard that one could have emoji's in domain names. And my understanding is apparently officially in IDN's you can't, but because it is a character set, some people, some registries have chosen to allow them anyway. That's a very brief summary, but is that a correct analysis, Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: That is correct, but there are some, what you might call emoji's, like smiley faces, which actually do have unicode (inaudible), although a very small number. But the vast majority of emoji's do not. So ones that actually, and have for a very long time had a unicode, and I might be using the wrong terminology here, Andrei would be able to correct me. But some symbols do actually have a unicode character set and they are able to be used. But your statement is actually correct, in that some registries are permitting the use of emoji's in domain names, any

old emoji. And that is a bad thing because of the degree to which users and usability can be exploited.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.   My understanding was the IDN RFC did not allow them, but people were doing them anyway, if they had code points. But I may have misunderstood that, but I guess we'll wait for the review. We have a long –

JULIE HAMMER: You are correct. The biggest issue for ICANN is at the top level. At the moment, there are none permitted at the top level, and SSAC is going to say, you must not permit that to happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can support that. Olivier, since you are not a current liaison, I presume your hand is up in response to this item? If so, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I don't know whether you – can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just to add a couple of things on this. I actually met with Asmus Freytag, who's one of the main people working in the IDNA working group in the ITF. He alerted me to this thing of emoji's and to the complexities of emoji's, because you could actually have the same emoji in a different color, that could be a different character altogether.

As Julie said, yes, a sub-set of emoji's are actually mapped in unicode. The IDNA 2008, which are the rules by which the ITF has defined the codes, has explicitly forbidden them because of the complexities. The shapes, you know, an emoji – the color, the different interpretations of the same emoji. In fact, there is a website which will show you this. Different interpretations in different websites leads to something extremely complex.

However, the discussion on the IDNA mailing list has been very sustained, because there is intense pressure from Microsoft, Apple, Samsung, device manufacturers that are seeing a market opportunity on this. And as you know, when these guys put huge amounts of pressure, then things tend to start creeping in the direction opposite to that of the sort of the common sense. So it's something that we definitely need to look at.

The (inaudible) currently is in the IDNA working group in the ITF, but I'm quite pleased to see that Patrick Feltstrom himself is in that working group, and obviously this has now transpired over to the SSAC as well and it's great to see some advice from them. That's all. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Julie, anything else? Your hand is up, go ahead. Go ahead Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry, talking without the microphone turned on. My apologies. I just want to mention a couple of the members at ITF working groups have also been working with the SSAC on this one, and that John (inaudible) and (inaudible) were both pretty eminent sort of folks in this area of expertise. Thanks very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Julie. Maureen, you're next.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry, just unmuting myself. Maureen for the record. I just wanted to raise the invitation that the ccNSO has given to individual members from ALAC to join their ccNSO PDP working group on the retirement of CCT (AUDIO BREAKS). I think it's actually sort of like, interesting that, you know, we're actually sort of like, being invited. I know I've actually asked to be a member of a working group, one of their working groups before and had to go through a major process. So it's sort of like, great. I think that we should offer that invitation to other members of the ALAC, if they would like to join as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did get that (AUDIO BREAKS). Yrjö.

EN

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah, this is Yrjö Länsipuro. I'd like to start the theory for the ALAC meeting in Johannesburg. We have a couple of items from Copenhagen which, where we could continue discussion, hoping to get more into the substance, to the details. That is to say, the community based applications and (inaudible) geographic significance. But at this stage, I will just ask everybody to think whether there are any new issues we want to talk about with the GAC and indicate in point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Yrjö. Any further comments from liaisons?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very briefly, Alan, Cheryl –

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just to let you know that the next meeting on the GSNO Council is on the 20th of this month, at a very convenient, for me, 21:00 UTC. I get lucky occasionally. The agenda, as it is to date, in addition to the usual administrivia, which does actually include one item, well it's several items you may be interested in, in terms of responses to GAC communiques etcetera from Copenhagen. You may be interested in,

but we won't know until the outcome, what the motion will carry or not regarding international Red Cross names.

You should know, I believe, that there was a facilitated meeting between GAC and GNSO in the Copenhagen meeting. And basically, the Council will determine at this meeting, amongst other things, whether or not it is going to initiate the Section 16 protest, which the Board has requested to reconvene the original PDP working group and sort of go back a bit more, to the point. So, that's probably one that we will be, from an observer status, interested in the outcome of. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. If there are no further comments, we will go onto the next item. Next item is item number five, review of action items from ICANN58. And although my name is listed, I will ask Heidi if she can take us through any of those.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you very much. This is Heidi. I have just posted the link to the action item page from Copenhagen. And just in the interests of time, I think that the progress on the action items, apart from the ALT, are doing well, so I'm going to skip all those, and just focus on the ALT meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright.

HEIDI ULLRICH: If that's okay, Alan? Okay. So the first one, and this is the one that I'd like to take a little bit of time, and Gisella is going to go over some of the research she's done. This is Heidi. I'm to discuss with Alan the note-taking issue in face-to-face meetings. And that is besides capturing action items. So Gisella has reached out to the ACFO support teams, and asked them what they do, just to get a better understanding of the level of note-taking for action items etcetera that they do. So I'm going to hand it over to her, to let you know the results of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and just for the record, we're a little bit over time right now, like 15 minutes. So please go ahead, but with that in mind.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan, I hope you can all hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

GISELLA GRUBER: Wonderful. I just reached out, as Heidi said, to various people to see how the note-taking was done, and to be quite honest, I've got a little bit taken up with ICANN59. I haven't put together everything that came back from them. But the general take on this is, I asked about the face-to-face sessions as well as the normal, for instance, for the GNSO for the council meetings and for the working groups. The council meetings, as you know, and Olivier and Cheryl knows, so what staff do is that they

capture action items which are done separately, are not passed out to the council list, and they are distributed then, after the meeting, as well as minutes, which are developed following the council meeting. For the working groups, what came back was that most working groups –

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, for the minutes, what level of detail are in the minutes?

GISELLA GRUBER: Have you seen the council minutes?

ALAN GREENBERG: I personally have many times, but other people in this group haven't.

GISELLA GRUBER: From what I've seen previously with the minutes, is that they take out the action agenda and then in between – for each agenda item, they will put any decisions that were made, and any general notes, but nothing in detail. What the GNSO have also told me, is that it can't replace nor the transcript or the recording. But I think that the most detailed minutes that the GNSO does do, is for the council.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Continue, please.

GISELLA GRUBER: I'm happy – then for the working groups, they capture the notes and the action items, which are intended to be a very high level. And then

again, not replacing the transcript, nor the recording. So (inaudible) basically said that it's not a scribing exercise, so it needs to be again, just high level notes. The SSAC, in any case, do not – they do it completely differently, but there again it is all internal. And because they don't want the private meetings recorded or transcribed. So I don't know if we can take that as an example. And at this stage I've only looked – I haven't had any response from the ccNSO, so I'll follow up with that and get back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. For the record, if you look at GNSO minutes, they're a little bit more than just the action items. They do try to describe sort of, in a paragraph or so what the discussion was about, to at least give someone an idea whether they want to go to the transcript or not. But it's more detailed matter, more substance than just the action items and the motions. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I think that as Gisella just said, each (inaudible) have the staff taking notes, minutes or any kinds of notes. And of course, the action items. I think that the notes or the minutes that we need (inaudible) is for each agenda item, the decision about it, what was discussed. It is on the agenda. And then what are the decision about it? We don't need more. If we have this very accurate, we are safe, we have everything. We are very happy with that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. My recollection is not everyone was happy with it. Olivier, do you have any input on this?

UNKNOWN: Alan, excuse me, it's just dropped.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I guess he doesn't have any input.

UNKNOWN: He's reconnected now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Olivier, I was asking –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan. I've missed the past 90 seconds, so I don't know what I should say about what.

ALAN GREENBERG: The question is, what are your thought – Tijani just said that all we need in the records is a record of what decisions were taken and that's all, everyone is happy with that. My recollection is you had expressed less than happiness with that, so I thought you might have something to say.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. We need, of course, the action items need to be there, but we also need just a line onto what topic was discussed, what were the different arguments put forward and what decision was made. And it's pretty straightforward. I mean, anybody who has taken minutes, you know, take a 10 minute discussion and you make five lines out of it. At least that spares someone from having to read five pages or eight pages of transcripts, which 10 minutes of discussion transcribes to. Perhaps even more than that. The whole point is to be able to refer to a discussion very quickly and know who said what, at what time. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a note, the use of the word minutes is probably less than useful. In some venues, corporate minutes explicitly do not say anything other than actions taken, because of legal liability. You know, the minutes have to be published and you don't want the actual discussions to be reflected at all in minutes. Other places clearly take a different position, that the minutes reflect the contents of the discussion itself. So I think we don't want to use that word as such, because it has so many different meanings. Tijani, go ahead. And I see Heidi's hand is up, you'll be next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you very much Alan. This is exactly what I mean. I think that if we want to have the content of the discussion we have to go to the transcript. But if you want to know what was discussed and what is the result of this discussion, is the decision taken, we have to go to the notes or to the minutes of the meeting. This is my understanding and is how I did all my life in organizations and etcetera. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We all have many different experiences, some of which match this, some don't. If you look at the ICANN Board meeting minutes these days, they actually do talk about what the discussion points were and the gist of the discussion, not just the decision. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Thank you, Alan. So, this is a really interesting discussion, and I think that the staff views need to be taken into account as well. I think the first step is getting the action items correct, and more detailed. And that relies on the Chair of the meeting, or the person leading that particular session, to clearly state a smart type of action item, with a deadline, with the person involved. You know, I think we have a way to get to that first. Then in terms of the notes, you just talked a little bit about it Alan, but there's a difference between a decision versus a discussion.

And if it's a discussion, there might be different views of what that discussion was. And that might take more time as well, from both staff and the people in the group. So that's something to take into account as well. It might be of interest to start thinking about using rapporteurs from the community. These could be people who are part of a mentoring program, who would like to be involved in the working group, or in a group discussion, and would like a role. And that they would then be able to start taking a minimal level of notes. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, Olivier has said 'x' to that. And if I had had the presence of mind, I would have also agreed. I think if it's going to be done, it's got to be done by someone who takes responsibility for it, and not a volunteer. Perhaps that's a different discussion. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly, Alan, exactly. We cannot lay on a volunteer to take notes. If we want to have efficient notes that we refer to as official document, it must be done by the staff. Anyone from the community can take notes, of course we will have rapporteurs, we will make people draft something. But the official notes that we can refer to should be done by the staff, because it is accredited.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Tijani. Maureen, if you can speak or comment. Okay, you just clarified. (AUDIO BREAKS) and then said you agree with us in the second sentence. That was a negative that shouldn't have

been there. I take it. Alright, I don't think we're going to progress this at this point. Clearly within ICANN there's a whole range of things. Gisella did a survey of AC/SO's, but if you look at the experience in cross-community working groups, we have varied from literally, almost transcribing everything everyone says, to now a much briefer attempt to summarize an intervention in a sentence or two. So it literally ranges all over the place within ICANN right now.

So I think we're going to have to revisit it, but I don't think we have the time at this point and I do want to allocate a little bit more time to go over this. Any further, or last comments before we – rather, sorry, Heidi, were there any other action items you need comments on? I did note one of the action items said ALAC instead of ALT being included in a group. I already asked for the ALT members who weren't on the list to have been added just after the Copenhagen meeting. I believe that's already done.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So Alan, just on that point. This is Heidi. Which mailing list is that? And then the other one is, also other relevant mailing lists. We need more direction for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know what the other mailing lists are. There's a mailing list maintained by David Olive that is used for scheduling, among other things, and periodic meetings with the CEO and various things. It's the one that for ALAC, had the Chair and the Chairs of the RALO, but not the rest of the ALT. And I believe a similar list is used for the lists that are

created for every meeting for scheduling issues. There may yet be another list, but I think that's the sum of them.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so I followed up – this is Heidi. So I followed up with Suzie on that one, I'll drop her a mail that you have one as well? I'll confirm with her, and then when you have a chance just let us know what the other relevant lists are.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, I asked for it to be on the scheduling meeting, which was what we were talking about at the time. I don't believe, for instance, this automatically includes the other ALT members in the CEO and executive dinner on the day before ICANN. I don't believe it does. That's not my call to invite people to a dinner.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And then, just the two final ones. Then there's some election items to work with Rob about the DDPP. And I think that that's going to be just an ongoing discussion at the regional secretariat level, at the regional leaders level. There's a little bit of discussion on that during the FBSC call today, so I think we're going to be hopefully having two regional leader meetings prior to Jo'burg, so we'll put that on there.

And then the final one is that Olivier – to liaise with next-gen students to come up with an At Large sticker design, and coordinate with myself, producing these stickers. So I'm not sure, Olivier, if you wanted to do that in Jo'burg, during the presentation to them, and have a bit of a

contest that they can maybe do at the ICANN information booth and then we can see what they come up with at the end of that meeting. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Heidi. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. We can certainly do that. A little art competition to find out who can come up with the coolest, smartest, next-gen – sorry, coolest, smartest At Large sticker. And by stickers, by the way, we mean the type of stickers that hackers and young people like to have on the back of their PC's when they go to conferences.

Usually they're exciting, they have some cool design that makes them cryptic at the same time, so it raises the attention of other people, saying, "What was that design for?". And it could well be something as simple as the At Large logo plus a few words around it. But we don't quite know yet, so hopefully competition should be a good thing to get them interested.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you, Olivier. This is Heidi again. Just a point, if we could expand that to all At Large members as well, including the almost 50 AFRALO ALS representatives that will be in Jo'burg as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine with me. It's Olivier speaking. I don't even know who wanted to restrict it to – I can't remember the discussion when we restricted it to next-gen. But obviously, maybe we can have an open

competition for designing the ALAC sticker or the At Large sticker. But at the same time, we do have to – we could do it from within At Large and with the next-gen, and with the fellows as well. But I'm sure we will get some people criticizing us, of course, for using resources for a competition on a sticker.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I think that that would be all done and fun, and probably a good way to get some interest at the ICANN information booth.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll note Olivier put in a synopsis of our previous discussion in the chat, at a level that he would expect to see if we ever did this in the future. One might want to look at it. I would tell you what time it was done, but for some reason we never have times on our chat, our Adobe Connect chat. Could we have times in our Adobe Connect chat? That's a request. I don't know how to turn it on, and I don't think I'm allowed to. But if we could have times on our Adobe Connect chat, then we could identify a comment by its time. And I'm patiently waiting here to see the time turned on, on the Adobe Connect chat.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, it's Gisella. No, it will, it will. It will, I did it last time. Excuse me, I'm just, I'm just looking for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: There we go! Not only that, but it's retroactive. I didn't know that. That's even better. The comment that Olivier made at 14:29 of the chat. That's marvelous, thank you, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: No, that wasn't me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, whoever turned it on, thank you. And whoever turned it on retroactively, that's the designer I guess. Thank you. Thank you to him or her as well. Is there anything else on action items from ICANN58?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. No. That would be the last one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. We are way over time now. The next item is a discussion I started on email, on ALAC At Large credibility. I have had significant pushback from Olivier and Maureen. And Maureen started off her discussion saying she does not believe we need to justify our existence. We need to worry about our credibility or try to justify our credibility. I found that exceedingly disturbing, because I've spent a very large part of my life for the last 10 years, trying to improve At Large and ALAC credibility.

And I'd like to continue the discussion on the list. We don't have the time to do it right now, but if indeed we don't need to worry about the

perception of the community to us, then I think that's an interesting concept. I strongly disagree with that and I'd like to hear other people's (inaudible) and I think that we'll bring it to the ALAC, because I think our credibility is what it's all about. And I see hands being up. I really don't have the time, but if people with hands up want a very short intervention, go ahead, but we will have to take this one to the list. We're all running out of time and there's some important issues we still need to address. Andrei, go ahead.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: I'll be short. We are credible. Period.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so you've decided we are credible, what other people think doesn't matter, which is essentially what Maureen said. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I agree with you that we have to care about our credibility. It is very important. And the last report of items showed that people are contesting our credibility. And the (inaudible) say is always contesting our credibility, so we have to care about our credibility. What I don't understand in your (inaudible) Alan, I read it carefully, is what we can do. And what I see at the end is almost nothing. We have to improve our work, that's all. That's all. We have to make those people in ALS's more involved. What are the mechanics we have to use to reach this point? We always stay the

same, so we know about it. But how we do it, it is not said in the document. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I will give one sentence, but again, this needs more discussion, but I think the meta discussion that we're having right now on whether we need to or not. What I was trying to do is create an analogy with another group that does have credibility, and try to look at how do they do it? And they do it by having a wide range of input. Not thousands. Not even hundreds. And saying that that is sufficient. And establishing with the community that that is a sufficient way of doing it. And that's the point I was trying to make. But I think the meta discussion on whether we need credibility or not of other people is perhaps a more important one. Yrjö and then Cheryl, and then I'll close the queue.

YRJO LANISPURO: Yeah, this is Yrjö. I think this question comes in two parts. First, is the existence of the ALAC or At Large somehow questioned? And I think it is not. I mean, without us, ICANN would not be a multi-stakeholder organization. It would be an industry association with some government participation. But the second point is, how do we do it? How do we organize it? And I feel that here, we have to communicate, we have to – even if we, ourselves, we think, we know that we are existing, is sensible. Still, of course, we have to tell our story, continuously to the other groups. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is Cheryl, for the record. I too, have worked a year or two on improving the access and let alone credibility of what we say. So I understand at the large level how important it is, and agree totally with Yrjö's suggestion that communication is the key here. But I'm not sure that we will be ever able to come up with a viable metric, because of the nature of who we act in the best interests of. That we'll say, you know, this sub-section of the number allows us to claim credibility to the naysayers. You are not going to convince those who see us as a threat or irrelevant. And I don't think, you know, changing the input from three to 33 or 3,033 will make one iota of a difference.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I guess I disagree with that, and I'll do it in writing, and we can have this discussion both via email and again, I'll allocate some reasonable amount of time in a future meeting to it. Next item is ICANN59. And I'll turn it over to, I think, Gisella. I don't know why my name continues to be on these agenda items when I don't host them, or I don't cover them.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, Gisella here, for the record. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

GISELLA GRUBER: Wonderful. Your name's there because your input is very important. Like everyone else's. Give me a second. There we go. Okay. I don't know why it's not. Abort. Proceed. I didn't put any 3D effects into anything here. It's on its way. Just as a reminder, if we start on ICANN 59, and I know that we're pressed for time, the deadline for submission for the cross-community topic is due today, Thursday the 13th of April.

The next planning call is Tuesday, the 18th of April. And on Tuesday, the 18th of April we are going to discuss the topics that have been submitted, as well as the block schedule to see what it is going to look like, and the block schedule will be posted on Friday, the 21st of April. Now I did prepare just a few slides to run through, but they don't seem to want to upload, so I'm just going to run through them off my computer.

To summarize, ICANN58 we had 11 hours of the ALAC and regional leaders working sessions. We had four working groups which met after each engagement At-Large Review, Capacity Building, and Technology Task Force. For the RALOs, we had EURALO General Assembly, the Joint AFRALO AFRICAN Meeting, a NARALA Meeting, and the regular At-Large Regional Leaders Meeting, which we used to call the Secretariats Meeting. The ALT met with the GAC and the ALAC met with the IPC.

Now looking ahead to ICANN59, the cross community sessions will be in the afternoon, one 75-minute session – oh, there we go, it's there – apologies for the delay. So I rattled through ICANN58 and this is what the scheduled looked like. It went up to 1500 and then after that we

had the cross community sessions, followed by the cocktails every evening.

Coming to 59, we've got the 75-minute cross community session, followed by the 90 minute non-conflicting cross community session, and then 60-minute cocktails every evening. Again, this is taken off the block schedule which is currently being shared with the SO, AC, SGC, RALO leaders, and it is likely to change next week after the cross community topics have been submitted. We will have the ALAC and regional leaders working sessions and the working groups. I've just listed those that I've met recently. We need to decide how we are going to select those who will be meeting, or whether we just ask all the working groups whether they wish to meet at ICANN59, bearing in mind that we might be quite restricted on time.

We have the AFRALO General Assembly, APRALO may have the meeting to prepare for ICANN60. At-Large regional leaders will be meeting again, the secretariat meeting, and then to decide whether EURALO, NARALO, and NACRALO are meeting. There was discussion that the RALO would meet if the meeting was taking place in their region the following ICANN public meeting, and then of course, the RALO in the region where the meeting was held. Question is, would we like to meet with the registry stakeholder group and the constituency stakeholders, including the IPCP CNI SPCP.   To refresh your minds, the ALT were not able to meet with these two groups in Copenhagen due to time constraints.

And then last, but not least, the meeting with the GAC, do we wish to have this with the ALT or the full ALAC?   In Helsinki, reminder, it was only with the GAC leaders and the ALT leadership.

Just to cover while we're at the social events, I'm not sure whether there's going to be anything local from the African host. I'm hoping there will be something. In Helsinki it was on the Monday evening. And other than that, what's currently listed on the schedule is a cocktail every Monday evening, it's just called the President's Cocktail, et cetera. Let's remember that at ICANN59 we'll have the AFRALO General Assembly, 46 ALS's traveling.   A few activities were listed, AFRALO General Assembly, the Daily Cal46 ALS's traveling.

A few activities were listed, AFRALO General Assembly, the daily Capacity Building sessions, the mentorship program, and the AFRALO Showcase. The organizing committee is meeting regularly to work on all of the events above. So what I would like to run through today is very important, the cross community topics, which ones will be submitted and if we look at the agenda, the proposed session is the EPSRP. I see there are three people, Alan would you like me to take the queue on this one?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'll take the queue. I note on the EPSRP there was suggestions that we hold such a meeting. There were also several suggestions that it may not be appropriate, and I did not hear anyone volunteering to host that, to organize that session. As far as I know, if someone doesn't volunteer to organize it, it will not happen. And I for one don't want to schedule a session and then cancel it because none of our people stood forward to do anything about it. Olivier, you're the first on the queue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was just going to comment on the RALOs not holding a meeting at the ICANN meeting. I thought this had already been agreed, and I'm surprised that it's still on the table.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have a clue. I know it was suggested, I don't know if it was agreed. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you very much. So, I think that was discussed during an At-Large or basically an ALAC meeting wrap up at the very end, and it was raised, and I don't know if there was sufficient discussion within the RALOs. Certainly the RALO leaders wouldn't have had time to go back to their representatives and ask if they were in agreement with that. So I think that was agreed was that for the policy form, that it would go ahead as a pilot, and then discuss perhaps regional leadership discussions, so they can have time to bring it back to their regions for discussion and perhaps a decision on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier do you want to follow, or are you okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I note the schedule that's been posted, but I'm also hearing things on other working groups. For instance, the RDS working group is requesting a 3-hour session, as not unexpected, for the actual PDP working group to meet, presumably within GNSO working hours. They are also requesting, Staff is requesting on behalf of them, and I hope everyone is sitting, a 3-hour non-conflicted public workshop for RDS, in addition to their own work. That is two 1-1/2 hour slots consecutive, which they I believe are also asking for unopposed. This is going to be an impossible meeting. I don't know how else to describe it.

I still do not see the – for anyone who was on the scheduling call last week, was it decided that they indeed would do unopposed high interest topic meetings? That they believe there are topics that are of interest to everybody in the whole meeting, and they're going to schedule a large enough room with it and make sure that everyone has a chance to talk. Is that really what was decided? Gisella? Anyone who was at the meeting? Was anyone at the meeting?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I was on the meeting, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and?

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Alan, I was on the meeting, and this was discussed and I raised the point that it shouldn't be absolutely restrictive. If topic is not interesting for one constituency, they have another activity in parallel. It must not be really forbidden for anyone to take any activity at the same time. And so there was no decision taken, but all, all comments were received and noted, and we don't know, the next call, they will tell us what they think about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can predict the outcome, but I won't say it out loud right now. Thank you, Tijani. Yrjo?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah, this is Yrjo Lansipuro. Talking about the meeting, about the meeting with the tech. I would like it to be a meeting with the ALAC. I think that was also the idea in Copenhagen, but unfortunately there was another event, another At-Large event scheduled, so there were rather few people at the meeting. I think it would be good to have an interface between the GAC and ALAC as broad, extensive as possible. That could also help to facilitate the in-country communications between the government and the ALS. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. What was scheduled against the GAC ALAC meeting last time? I didn't think we had anything scheduled against it?

YRJO LANSIPURO:	I think that was the meeting with the MCUC, the EURALO MCUC.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Ah.
YRJO LANSIPURO:	Alan, and there was also the finals and budge, the group meeting.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah, but that, none of us went to. So I don't think that one impacted our attendance at the GAC meeting. Noted. I think at this point the decision has been that we will try to meet with the entire ALAC, not just leadership. So, certainly, if we meet with the GAC, it is with the ALAC, if we meet with GAC leadership, it might be the ALT, but I think at this point we're looking for a full session, if we can find a place to put it. Tijani, is that a new hand?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Yes, a new hand. I didn't speak yet.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Go ahead.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Okay, so, first, first, about Olivier's remark, I'd like to ask that this issue be put on the next ALAC meeting, so that ALAC will decide on it.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Heidi, if you can make sure that's to be done?

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That the first point. Second point, in the social events, I didn't see our social event, AFRALO social event, so we need to include it, and we ask that one of the cocktails be replaced by the showcase or by the social event of AFRALO. The activities of AFRALO were as Gisella said, the mentorship program, general assembly, but also local community engagement, and we are working on that. We don't know yet what will be exactly the form of this engagement, but we will do that. And that's all, thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I would suggest you don't want to replace a Chairman's or President's Cocktail with an AFRALO event, I think you want to schedule them simultaneously, so we avail ourselves of their wine.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, if we are organized simultaneously, we will not have anyone, because people will go and drink there.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, same venue.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did we note that we'll make sure to put the issue of RALO meetings on the ALAC agenda as an action item for Heidi for the next...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, yes, this is Heidi. So, on the ALAC agenda...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that is what we're looking at.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We'll get that. Okay. But, um, this is Heidi. I'm just noting that because eventually it needs to be discussed within the RALO, I would hope.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we can discuss it at the next, we can wait for the next ALAC meeting or we can send out something by email saying it has been raised, and be prepared to discuss it with your RALO and be prepared to talk about it on the ALAC meeting. I would suggest that's probably a more rational thing to do. That is, give them a heads up. The next ALAC meeting is I believe in two weeks or so. So, if we send out a message like that, and Olivier, since you're one of the people who originated it, or you're the one who brought up in this meeting in any case, why don't you send a message out to the secretariat?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, I'm happy to help Olivier with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine, an action item jointly for you and Olivier, then.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, and then, and I know that a couple of people have their hands raised, but Gisella is desperately trying to get some information, as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then, Gisella, please go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, I'm going to sound awfully desperate here, but we are the 13th of April and I need to submit the topics for the Cross Community GNC sessions. I think that we've kind off veered off that subject.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll go back to that before we finish.

GISELLA GRUBER: Please, just don't forget that. That would be much appreciated. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I won't forget. Andrei, did you have something you wanted to raise?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Yeah, hi, it's Andrei. My proposal was to Tijani, maybe to organize AFRALO local ALS with a jazz band, so it will be a community event for the particular people.

ALAN GREENBERG: I suspect they want something with a wider community than that, but I don't know, I have no problem. Tijani can certainly work with you and Olivier. I think Olivier has a little bit knowledge about that. Tijani, is that a new hand?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, alright. Let's go back to the item that Gisella raised. Do we want to formally propose any high interest topics? The issue, the only issue that was raised on our mailing list was the EPSRP and the process for conflict resolution perhaps between two groups. Whether that particular topic will still be a hot one in June, I would like to think it will not be, but we don't have direct control over that. Maybe Maureen or Julie have some input as to whether they think it will be resolved, but at this point I think it is out of all of our hands.

I'm not sure we would want to host, the ALAC wants to host a meeting on how do we resolve problems between other groups, when we're not one of the main groups involved. At least I don't think I want to run that meeting. Do we in fact want to have this meeting, and if so, we need someone to volunteer to organize it. The main proponents of it were Holly, I believe, Javier, I'm not sure who else supported it. Is there any desire in this group to push that forward, the discussion on the mailing

list did die. Julie has to leave for an SSAC meeting, thank you for joining us, Julie. Maureen, go right ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Maureen for the record. I disagree with Julie. I'm keeping in touch with the trainer and we're hoping that they will have resolved it by that meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, I'd like to think so. I don't have an interest in trying to do a generic one of how do we resolve problems between rocks and hard places. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I think that if we want to hold this event on this hot topic, we need to consult first with the SSPAC, because if we hold it alone, it will be nonsense. It will state our position, and that's all. We need people from both sides to speak on this panel. This is how it will be useful. And we need their approval before we decide to hold such an event.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, you're echoing exactly what I said. If we are to suggest that topic, we have to volunteer to organize it, including getting speakers, and getting committed speakers. I have not seen any indication that we have an interest in doing that. I can take it the list again, and why don't we put an action item for me to go back to the list and say, last call, is

anyone interested in doing this, and I'll itemize the things they have to do. I predict we will get no takers, but I am willing to do that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I thought that Gisella said today is the deadline for submitting the topics.

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, today?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Alan, the audio there was choppy? What about the deadline?

ALAN GREENBERG: When is the deadline for topics?

GISELLA GRUBER: Today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Today, okay, I'm sorry, I misheard you.

GISELLA GRUBER: I'm thinking close of business, LA time, and in Los Angeles it is currently midday, so I'm saying we've got another 3, 4, 5 hours.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I will send out a message saying since nobody has volunteered, we are not submitting. Same action item, slightly different words. Anything else, people? We are one minute past the hour. Gisella, is that a new hand? Old hand?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, old hand, old hand, thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are now on elections, they will be announced shortly. Somebody may put a link to the page in the chat, I don't think we need anything else to discuss at this point. We are talking about elections for ALAC members, recommendations for non-com delegates, elections for RALO Chair, Secretariat, Vice Chair, whatever positions are open in ALO. There is no election for Chair at this point, unless I choose to resign. That's about it. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, this is Heidi. Just to really quickly note, elections across the board will start on the 1st of May, that's when the call for nominations will be

sent, except in NARALO and they've already started a week ago, and they have a good number of people applying. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Seeing no hands, and seeing I'm already late for another meeting, anyone has any other business? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, thank you all. We'll see you around on the net. Bye-bye.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you all, this meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]