
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team monthly call on Thursday the 27th of April, 20h00 UTC. On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Holly Raiche, Andrei Kolesnikov, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Apologies noted from Yesim Nazlar. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Gisella Gruber. And welcome to Julie Hammer who's just joined us. If I could also just remind everyone to please state your names when speaking, for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm going to try really hard to make this a short meeting. I don't know about the rest of you but the number of meetings that I've been in for the last two days is well over two digits in hours, and I'm sort of reaching the end of my limit. And I have a few other things I have to do, including getting my taxes in by the end of the weekend. That being said, there are a number of issues that we're going to have to address and hopefully perhaps come to closure on. In terms of At-Large Policy Development, we did a rather exhaustive review.

First of all, are there any other business items that we want to raise? Seeing none, hearing none, we'll use the agenda as distributed. On policy, we spent a lot of time on it and added a bunch of things to my to-do list that I'd forgotten about. Some of them have very tight

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.

deadlines. Are there any policy issues that have changed since the ALAC meeting that we need to review right now?

ARIEL LIANG:

Alan, this is Ariel. I suppose you want me to (inaudible). Nothing has changed except for the status of two public comments. And one is on the FY18 Operating Plan and Budget and the draft is up and so it's in the internal commenting period. And one thing I want to clarify with you is, are we still going to submit the statement on time or would you need a few days after the deadline, which is tomorrow, to finalize the statement?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Do you think we'd get it if we had a few days? If we asked?

ARIEL LIANG:

Well, I already checked with the staff support. They just provided me with the official response. They would not officially consider the comments submitted after deadline but they would still reference it, make sure their response is comprehensive. And I pointed out that ALAC is part of the empowered community so you should consider ALAC comments. But they didn't respond further.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would have preferred to do this one ratified before we submitted, but given what you just said, we will submit and then ratify. But we will have to do something after this call to remind people that we

have one more day. If anyone other than Christopher Wilkinson, who has already stated his opposition to one part of it, has any things they have concerns of, they will need to raise them pretty quickly. So, Tijani, are you close to finishing your revision? I haven't had a chance to look since we last talked. If you've made any changes or not or what your timing is? And you're muted right now. You can talk or write in the chat if that's easier. I hear a lot of background noise but not Tijani. Can you tell us what the status is and when we will see, if not already, the revised statement?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I have a problem with dual audio. Can you please repeat, I didn't understand what you said.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, the question is, when will we see, if not already, the revised statement, based on the discussions in the Finance and Budget sub-committee? It is there already?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

It is there, except the last update you made on the paragraph regarding the website. I discussed it with you but you didn't respond me. I didn't want to remove one word. No, new on Skype.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Ah, I haven't looked at that. I will look at it as soon as this meeting is over.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. But everything is okay now, except this, and I will include it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright then. Then once we resolve that I will send out a last call message to the ALAC. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. A couple of things. First of all, the transparency, I know it's come to the vote. But just wanted to let you all know, as I let APRALO know, that the Review Team's already going through our PC's and it could very well be finished, our review of the public comments, before the ALAC one gets in. There you go, never mind, we'll open it up again and deal with it. But you know, it's the product of way too many things coming down the pipeline at the same time. I know we can't fix that but we do need to recognize it. I'm not just suggesting that we make any changes, I'm just raising the awareness that right now with the speed of other things happening with all of these "little" public comments. And they're "little" only in from where they're coming from, in other words, little factions of PDP processes or cross-community working group activities, they're not little in importance.

But, you know, we are going to be beginning to be treated superficially I suspect in some of the cases if we're not careful. Then the second point was, where my name is associated with yours, Alan, in some unholy relationship and liaison on a couple of the public

comments processes. Most of them I'll just suck it up and live with, even though I'm not sure why I should have to. But one I do have an issue with and that's the one that's you and I for the CC2, I think we need to look at the extensive requirements of the CC2. Alan, I'm pretty sure you're fairly aware how much that work is, but I think unless this is carved up into a few slices, neither you or I are going to pay any attention to it. From my perspective, because I'm on the leadership team of all of these things and I'm too busy doing the analysis of things that are coming in, and that's an unhealthy bias.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry, Cheryl, what is CC2?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And we've got to do this because we were very bad at getting in the report for CC1. It's the Community Consultation for the new (crosstalk).

ALAN GREENBERG:

The gTLD one, sorry, I was thinking of something with the CCT Review. Sorry. You got me completely lost.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

My problem, and I shouldn't have used the shorthand, I apologize.

ALAN GREENBERG: Your point is we have to get off the something and get these things done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm suggesting that two people, especially me as one of them, as a pen holder on that, is bullshit, is what I'm suggesting. And I don't know how you or I would think we had the time to do it. I think this is just a random assignment of names because you and I happen to be the only people working on the bloody project.

ALAN GREENBERG: Because you and I are the only ones that have a clue what's going on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's not the point of Community Consultation. We need opinion. It could go even out to the RALO's and ALS's. Right? Because it's questions, for example, about name collisions and actual harms or risks, right? You actually don't necessarily need to be an active member of the PDP process to be responding to those questions, and I think we should look elsewhere for the input on them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then who is going to be assigned that to actually do it and orchestrate it? I'm not asking Cheryl, I'm asking the general group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That one really needs work, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree with you completely on the analysis. I don't know what the answer is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I've raised it with the leadership team. We're going to have to think about it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, but we'll end up thinking about it until the end of the deadline. I'm sorry. You're not catching me at the best of times.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nor I, Alan, which is another reason it's important for the leadership team, and the ALAC at its meeting, to consider this. The deadline is, I think, end of May.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we could wait until the ALAC meeting of the last week in May and then raise it there. That would be really opportune. I don't think we have that option.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that's what happened with CC1, isn't it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fine. We don't put anything in.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I still ask the question, somebody is going to have to take charge of this. Do we have either any volunteers or any suggestions for someone in our community who we might coerce into taking responsibility for this? We have people from every region on this call. Can anyone think of a likely candidate?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, can we put a call out on the ALAC list which has got the regional leaders on it?

ALAN GREENBERG: The public list? Sure.

HOLLY RAICHE: Could we also suggest a webinar so that people who really might think they could do something have at least an inkling of what the issues are? That would be really helpful in getting people interested.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, can you reach out? Put an extra (inaudible) to reach out to staff, whoever the staff person is responsible?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve Chan, Emily and Julie Hedlund.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'm just wanting to support what Holly's saying. I think it's one of the things that we've actually raised before about—and, you know, this one's not due until the 25th of May or something, isn't it—that, when we've got the time and we need the input that, you know, just informing people and letting them know what it's all about, and so that they can be better informed, and when they're reading through it they've got an idea of what's it's about, they can make a comment. So, if we can encourage that it would be great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have an action item already to cause it to happen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on that because New gTLD is kind of important, Alan, sorry. Cheryl again for the record. It might be worthy of us having a look at the questions, because it's questions on four different work tracks. Four entirely different sub-topics and issues, right, within the general terminology of what we're dealing with in New gTLD's. We can probably carve it up under those four. But rather than allocate it to, you know, four different people, with four different groups, which we could still do, maybe have it as four different Wikipages so people can comment on as little or as much as they want to do. Because

ALAC has to give its opinions on as much of it as possible, but it should get its feedback and input from as many as possible. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I still believe we need someone to take charge of actually overseeing this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Agreed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is this something we can assign to staff? Anyone on staff can comment. Does it sound like something that you can take responsibility for?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I'm able to help staff. I just can't write and review my own work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, do you have someone who you think can work with Cheryl on this one?

UNKNOWN: I'll help her.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know who said that. It may have been Ariel but it may not have been. It didn't quite sound like anyone I recognized.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, sorry, it was Maureen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, please say what you said again.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, okay, sorry, I said that I needed some time to think about that and I would get back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we'll come back to this one at the end of the meeting.

HOLLY RAICHE: Actually, Alan, Maureen said she'll over see it as long as you get four people to take charge of each section.

ALAN GREENBERG: The first part of overseeing is finding the four people then.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We'll have to work on the four people.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, Maureen, can you, with staff, get something that can be sent out, or at least addressed for me to send out, to the ALAC list? I don't care who sends it. I'm willing to do it under my name, if you think my name helps any. And Leon just said he's willing to do something if he can be of any help. I'll leave it to the two of you to work and request whatever support you can get from staff. And let's use this as an experiment to see whether we really can get input. Ariel, back to you, what other items do we have?

ARIEL LIANG: The other one is just that the African Strategy Statement is on the Wiki on for comment. And there's no other changes to our other comments, except for the ones that are being ratified. Nothing else urgent right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cheryl, when you started off I think you were effectively talking about our credibility, if we're not careful. You were talking about the concept of ratifying after the fact or something else.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To be honest, people who are dealing with public comment input don't really give a shit whether we ratify it or not. We give a shit that we've got it. If you want to ratify after we've done the PC analysis, that's fine by us.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine. I wasn't sure if you were identifying that as one of the critical issues or not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think eventually ratified. Absolutely essential. Having it ratified before we get to analyze it in a timely manner? Not so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I understood correctly, thank you. Okay, next item is updates from liaisons. Do any liaisons have any input they want to provide at this point? I'll take that as a no. Unless I hear a voice or see a hand relatively soon. Julie says, all in her report. Thank you, Julie. Maureen is typing something, I'm assuming it's something similar. Okay, next item.

At-Large Review. There was a meeting of the review working party the other day with ITEMS. It was an interesting meeting for those that didn't attend. I will candidly say, although I know this is recorded, transcribed and publicly available, the belligerence that we saw at some levels was interesting. And we are not expecting anything substantive to change. I wouldn't be surprised if the recommendation on auctions and the ALT changes, just because it was pointed out to them that what they wrote did not make any

sense whatsoever. But they may choose to ignore that as they have before. The number of statements they made which were passively false, but that they still seemed to believe, was interesting. And going forward at this point, as I said, we're not expecting a lot of change, there may be a bit of change. We will have to have the final report which is our recommendations to the Operational Effectiveness Committee in before the Annual General Meeting, well before the Annual General Meeting. But other than that there's no great rush. And there has been some suggestions from Cheryl and Holly as to what we need to do between now and then and I'll let them talk and then I'll come back with one other issue related to that. Cheryl or Holly, whoever wants to take the mic. Olivier has his hand up first, do you want to get in before?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I was just going to ask one thing which was whether there would be a short re-cap or summary of the discussion that had taken place on that call. I've had several people that have Skyped me and knowing that I was on there and said, "Oh, you know, is there like a summary or something of the discussions or any of the updates?" I didn't know if there was any such thing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Then we need to let Cheryl and Holly talk.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay. Thank you for the leading question, Olivier. We've decided on the way forward and it's Chery's suggestion, we, in the next day or so, develop a document to say, this is actually what happened at the call between ITEMS team and the working party. And I think the summary is, as Alan said, which is, not much. But also included in the document some of our outlining the way forward as well which is where we're going. So we will probably be producing a couple of documents in the next day or so. One is a report back on that all. Number two is some kind of email that basically says this is where we are and these are the next steps forward, this is what we've got to do between now and whenever.

And really, one of the points that was made in the call that we just had was, actually we've done an awful lot of work already. We have already accepted many of their recommendations. We've framed answers for many of the other things that they said. And from the call that we were on yesterday they have said really very little that is different from the previous calls that we've had with them. As I also said yesterday, the one thing that was of value in the last call with them was they started with, these are in the ICANN bylaws, these are the sort of three conclusions that we came to, it's a good place to start.

And one of the things that a number of us had asked of ITEMS is, rather than mixing up their identification of issues and their solutions, to be clear about what they saw as the issues, because in the ALAC way forward for those recommendations that we either support only partly or don't support at all, we need to come up with our own solutions as to how to address some of the issues that are

identified that we see as issues. So, there will be something that's going out fairly soon, so everybody knows what happened, but also outline the way forward. So that's where we're up to. And the other thing that was of interest to today's meeting is that Lars expects their final, final report to be ready to submit it to the Board within a week or two. It's surprising it's so close but then considering how little of what has changed between reports, maybe it's not surprising at all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cheryl, anything to add?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, one of the things that Holly alluded to is, we spent a lot of time essentially saying which recommendations we don't support. How we proceed forward on the recommendations we support partially or fully is relatively easy. Going forward there are a number of things that are embedded in the recommendations that we are categorically rejecting, but those things are not necessarily bad things. And the example I'm using, but it's not the only one, is, their EMM effectively says that we bring to both ICANN meetings but more importantly GA's, and in our case, summits, we bring people who are actually going to benefit from the meetings or who can

contribute to the meetings, as opposed to a representative of each ALS.

And that's a concept that has some merit, I think warrants discussion. Going forward to the OEC, we do not need to propose alternatives for everything, if we can justify why their recommendation is particularly bad. On the other hand, if we can come to closure on things before then, then so much the better. So I think there are maybe some discussions we want to have as we're going forward, before formulating results, that are worth having. We'll talk a little bit more about that when we talk about the Johannesburg meeting though. So I'm going to wrap up my section on this. Anyone else have any comments on the At-Large review at this point? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. I think that for this final phase of our effort, we need perhaps to change the way we are working. I don't think that we need to speak about recommendations that we support or we don't support. We have to speak about the main ideas of the proposal of ITEMS. And to prove that those ideas, those solutions, don't solve any of the problems identified by the analysis that they did, and that we share most of them. So, I think that the best way at this time is to try to prove that the solutions don't solve the problems.

And second, we have to emphasize on all the wrong declarations they did and they built their recommendation on, we have to do

that. I think this is the only way to convince people, to make things clear for people. Because now there is a big confusion. You see recommendation and recommendation, and then in one recommendation you have several things. A small part you support, another part you don't support. So I think we have to get rid of this weight work and try to see what are the main proposals of ITEMS, very clear, and get rid of working groups, get rid of the summits, get rid of the ALS's, etcetera. So, those are the main ideas. And explain how those ideas don't solve the problems identified. And also emphasize on any wrong declaration they made. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, thank you. Tijani, I would love to be able to do that but what the Board wants to see is how we respond to the recommendations. We do not have a choice. Full stop. So, our structure has to be a response to what they say. We have to identify, these are the things we agree with, these are the things we don't agree with. We don't have to spend a lot of time on saying we agree with this, we agree with that. But we have to do it because that is what's going to be asked of us. I agree we have to spend a lot more time on, if we don't think that what they have proposed works. We have to say why and we have to say what we are going to do. We recognize there are issues, and Alan has rightly pointed out there are issues. And then we have to say, we think this is a better way and why. But we don't

have a choice. Okay? We will have to respond to their report, like it or not. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Holly. On the better way, if we have something that we want to propose at that point, fine. We also can say, we understand this is an issue and we are working on it. The time constraints are such that we may not have the perfect answer. However, look, there's a lot of things going on here. We have a public image which they have demonstrated clearly we have a problem with. We're not going to fix that with the OEC but we have to think about that. We also know there are significant issues and we have to look at how are we going to get the best—look, this review process has been something I wouldn't wish on my enemies.

But at the same time, we have gone through it now and to the extent we can salvage good out of it, despite the agony that went along with it, so much the better. And we are going to have to be thinking about that, of how can we actually use this to do some good? Not only to, you know, fix the scarred territory that they've created. But so be it, in any case. There's a lot of work to be done. I've suggested that we take a week or two off at this point and just relax. There's so many other things going on as we see in the Public Comments, that I think we need a bit of a breathing space. And we do have a good number of months before we have to get this report in. So, although we do want to get a report out to the community on the working party meetings, I think we need a little bit of a hiatus to get our

breath back and stop cursing and look at this rationally and calmly.
May I go on to the... apparently not, Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan, do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. We can hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I think that, yes, we may have a full report—

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, we have a bad echo, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that it will not be enough. We need to make this report to state one by one the main ideas of their recommendations and try to demonstrate, we prove that those recommendations or those ideas will not solve the problem. And also, we have to make it clear that this affirmation that made them make this recommendation is wrong. And we have the proof, this is the proof. People will understand that. If you want the formal report with the formal response to each recommendation, we can do it, but we have to do this other report which will really help us having our ideas understood well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, why don't you put in writing who this report would be going to. Because I'm not sure I quite understand but we really don't have the time to flush this out right now and we have a good number of months ahead of us. So, I'm interested. It's quite clear what we have to say to the OEC, to the Operational Effectiveness Committee, and that's the target that we are obliged by the process to respond to. If you're proposing we do something else in addition, I'd really like to understand, if you could perhaps write a paragraph or two on what you think this should contain and who it's going to, I would appreciate that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any final words on the review before we go onto the next item which is ICANN59? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Alan. I was trying not to. Cheryl for the record. Just to raise with the leadership team, there's a number of opportunities that the review working party leadership have recognized at least, where we should be, for the want of a better word, workshopping some aspects of the learnings and observations out of the review process so far. I raised the concern that doing this at the next appropriate opportunity which would be Joburg is going to in fact feed the trolls,

because we will be in a policy meeting not doing policy again. Alan, quite reasonably, countered with that, well, you know, true, but we've got to get this finished by year end and therefore. So I'm perfectly happy to go along and manage and assist with workshopping a couple of things in a very public way which may meet some of Tijani's concerns as well. But I think the leadership team need to recognize if we do that and we probably are going to have to do that because it would be better face-to-face, rather than virtual. We may follow up with some virtual work in Joburg. But we're going to have to spin it carefully and I don't think we need to discuss that, Alan, but I just wanted to raise it with the leadership team. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. That in fact is one of the items that was going to be under the next agenda item. So consider it now raised. Tijani, is that a new hand? No, it is not. Alright. Once we look at the block schedule and such, one of the first items I did want to talk about under Joburg is in fact the item Cheryl has just raised. But I'll turn it over to Gisella first who I presume is leading this and then raise the issue in a more specific way. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. Gisella for the transcript. I'm just going to tackle this, it may not follow the agenda completely. I just want to put forward the points that I would need to start then having a call with the planning committee to actually start filling the blue boxes under

the ALAC section. So, I'm first of all just going to say that this is the latest version of the block schedule we have. There was initially, not an issue, but the GAC had brought something up about the Wednesday afternoon, the session of 'Who Sets ICANN Priorities' clashing with 'GAC Communiqué' but fortunately that has cleared up. So as it stands now I haven't seen anything else that could potentially change this now, but again, it hasn't been posted on the ICANN59 website as of yet. So, if you would like to run through the days. We did run through this on the ALAC meeting. Sorry, has everyone got scrolling rights because you might just want to scroll at your own pace.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We do have scrolling rights.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Fantastic. Just running through the cross-community sessions, the Monday 26th, we've got the welcome which is currently just scheduled for 30 minutes. It's the welcome and the Multistakeholder Ethos Award presentation. We then move on the first cross-community session, Community Forum on Proposed Fundamental Bylaw Amendments. In the afternoon we've got a two-hour block which is the Next Generation gTLD RDS Policy Requirements. The Tuesday morning, I'm not quite sure about that first slot there so I've asked Tanzania a little bit of input for that first slot there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, Gisella. As you're going through this, if you know which ones are designated as 'thou shalt not oppose the session', can you tell us as you go along?

GISELLA GRUBER: Oh, I so wish I had that information for you. I've been trying to see whether the other SO/AC support had any information on that, whether they'd had a preview on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: How can we start scheduling until we know what we're allowed to schedule?

GISELLA GRUBER: I know. Hence, just saying, yes, I didn't even want to bring it up about what can be conflicting, what can't. And I've been chasing Tanzania saying, we really need the final. Because the meeting forms, as Heidi has very kindly pointed out, have opened. Needless to say my stress levels are increasing because we need to have the final schedule, it's not out on the main page. Yet everyone is building up their agenda. So, just in the first instance, if I may, you've seen that we may not need to go through all of the cross-community sessions now, because as you said, the most important is to find out which are non-conflicting and therefore also help us with our schedule.

If I may, just the point that I need a little bit of guidance on, which we need a little bit of guidance on, on this call this evening, and then I

know that you'd like to get to the following bit of the agenda, is, Heidi and I had a quick discussion on the working groups which we thought would be meeting, and there would be six of them. Dev will be in Johannesburg which is fortunate for the Chair of a couple of the working groups. So we've got the outreach and engagement, technology task force, accessibility, public interest, the academy and the At-Large review working party. So again maybe, this is open to discussion whether you're all in agreement that we can go ahead with these working groups. I'm not sure how much time each working group is going to get. If anyone wishes to be a little bit more precise, whether it needs to be a 90 block or a 75 minute block, it really depends how we're going to be able to schedule them, and against what, depending on the working group members.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Do I need to point out that all of those, with the exception of the Public Interest, will be construed as, ALAC is again looking internally and not doing any policy. Cheryl? Was that something you were going to say?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I actually put up my hand to say we could ditch Accessibility, it saddens me. But I honestly don't think Accessibility is our meeting to run in a policy meeting. I wanted to raise at an Accessibility meeting that we probably should look at a twice a year meeting update, being the first and last in the year. Not that we should under-focus but in fact I am very pleased with the progress that ICANN is making and

continues to make in this. We possibly could have an ad hoc informal gathering where we sort of touch base with key staff and see how we're going on projects, that's probably wise, if it fits in and if it doesn't, so be it, in a policy meeting. But it's not just a matter of freeing up time, I think, it is something that we're still carrying the burden on which is wider than us and I'm very aware that we need more time and space to play within our agenda. But it still needs to be done twice a year, that's fine. Yeah, Alan, it is a worry when so many of our work groups are demonstrably not policy based. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We still have shown a complete inability to re-start the actual policy groups, which I guess says something, but I'm not quite sure how I want to interpret it. I don't know, what is the feeling of this group? Again, we do not make decisions here, despite what ITEMS says. But I value the opinion of this group. Should we be sensitive to the fact that ICANN has branded this as a policy forum, without consulting us I would point out, and therefore it is verboten to do non policy issues. Or should we thumb our nose at it and do what we think needs to be done? No one has any opinion? Go ahead, Olivier. And Holly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG:

We can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay thanks. It's a Policy and Outreach Forum and we keep on repeating this and they say, oh yeah, of course, of course, it's outreach. But for the most, it's a policy forum. But with regards to doing our own things, I personally feel that we do need to try and focus a bit on policy and make use of this time to discuss policy issues as much as we can. That's all. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Are you saying we do not run some of those other working groups?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Well, it's Olivier speaking, I have suggested that the RALO's do not meet and that's one thing which is currently under discussion in the RALO's, I don't know what the latest results are on that. That would free up a few slots for policy discussions. Maybe there should be a better balance of it. But I mean, do some working groups really need to meet face-to-face at every ICANN meeting? Maybe we need to find out if there is an actual need for that working group to meet because there's some real hot topic going on then that working group should meet face-to-face. But if it's just an ongoing thing then this being a four day meeting and being very short and tight for time we might wish to say, well look, can't you just meet at the next meeting, over at the AGM, which is a longer meeting. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The question I always ask is, what is it you're getting that a face-to-face benefits you, that a teleconference doesn't? Especially for the groups where they get large attendance at the teleconferences. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, in theory I like to do policy, and in theory that's why I've always tried to have some kind of, at least, you know, it was the WHOIS last time, okay, but at least one or two hours of what are the current policy issues and having time for us to come to some opinion on it now. RDS is going to go on for everyone's lifetime and perhaps after that, but what are the big ticket items that are on the policy agenda and, for example, in our last call, and earlier in this call, it may be a terrific opportunity to get our head around some of the issues that are being raised. We could reinstate what we used to do which was to have two hours of discussion on policy and bring people in. So in fact we have GNSO people and we have SSAC people in to talk about stuff. But with four days, I don't know, and certainly from my point of view and from the review point of view, I think in the case of the At-Large review that is something that is so critical for us that I would agree with you, we need to meet face-to-face.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We don't have a choice on that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, where it's really so critically obvious that we meet then we should do so without any qualms.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I had always this question in my mind, why we are meeting face-to-face? Why for some working groups, we are meeting face-to-face? Especially if there is not special things, if there is not a special issue that we have to do it face-to-face. And the ongoing work should be done as we do it now virtually. And I agree with what Olivier said. But if one group, if it is not a policy group, has something important to do and the group needs it to be done face-to-face, we will do it in Johannesburg, even if it is called a policy forum, and even if the working group is not a policy working group. In my point of view we don't have to be bound by their decisions about the name of the meeting. For example, the Capacity Building working group, we don't meet regularly face-to-face.

And especially the two last meetings we didn't meet and I asked not to meet because I don't see what is the added value of being face-to-face. We are meeting virtually, this is enough. But this time, the platform, the ICANN platform adapted to our webinars and so the lessons now, we have lessons from our webinar ready now to be— they sent me the results, I have to see it, and if it is okay, I will ask for a face-to-face meeting, because I will show our working group what

we have now. We'll add to that the e-book facilities that Glenn is kindly is helping us with it. So we have new tools for the working group, we will meet face-to-face. If we don't have those new tools to show the people, we will not meet face-to-face. I think this is the philosophy we have to follow. They don't make us do what they want. We do what is good for us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone else want to speak on this? I'm not quite sure where this is leading us. Gisella, why don't we go back to you and at least call out the titles of the common sessions. I will give a bit of preamble on the first one, and that's the community forum. As you may remember we approved the accountability measures and that says, if the empowered community ever wants to take any action on something there must be a community forum. There's currently a proposal from the Board that certain bylaws be changed. They are bylaws which require the approval of the community to be able to be passed. Therefore there must be a community forum.

The statement has been made that since it's the first one, even though it is essentially a non-issue, we will go through the process and they are labeling this a cross-community, for a high interest topic. I'm going to have to be at that meeting because I've been appointed as the formal representative of ALAC in the Empowered Community. I cannot imagine a more boring meeting for the rest of the group to have to attend however. And so really what we're saying is you can sleep in the first morning, but we're going to have

to decide whether to hold something against it or not. Gisella, back to you.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Back to me. Just to get a clear summary on what you just said for the working groups. Do we agree that they don't meet? And the At-Large Review, do they need to meet? Outreach and Engagement as there is meant to be an element of outreach at the public forums. Technology Task Force, Public Interest and Academy, it's just, I know that the decision's not made here but it does take out an hour minimum or a 75 minimum slot per working group. It will just help me put the pieces of the puzzle together.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Nobody? Accessibility, thank you, Cheryl. Capacity Building, yes, thank you, Tijani. Do we ask whether the TTF... well, Outreach and Engagement I would have thought, yes. Do we ask TTF, Public Interest, and Academy if they want to...?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well yes, the question is, is there something that they have to do that cannot be done remotely. Now, I don't want to hold another meeting of the Academy saying we have to reform this group in a different forum. We've had about three of those already. So, if the

Academy has to meet it shouldn't be under ALAC auspices at this point. Technology Task Force. Again, unless they have something which is overwhelmingly a reason why we need to devote a room to it, and have a public meeting, why are we doing it at a public meeting? There may be an answer. I don't know what it is, and if so, I think we need to understand what that is. And to answer Olivier, in theory, yes, but as far as I know it has not actually been done. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks and I'm sorry, I'm in two calls at once, so if I'm a little delayed, it's interacting, forgive me. If I put something totally inappropriate in terms of topic in the chat it's because I've mixed up my screens. I think I've got it right this time though. I think that the Technology Task Force is one of those that, like Accessibility, probably does need the occasional face-to-face, because of its requirement and benefit of interacting with some of the key staff in ICANN who own some of the spending areas and the development areas that they work in so closely. So I think that's probably one that will end up suggesting we treat like Accessibility. You know, a twice a year event if needs be. I certainly think that we need to work on making sure that the Academy comes out of just our agenda I think and scheduling, and becomes more what it should be reflecting. Thanks. And Outreach and Engagement, obviously.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll point out, ICANN is really trying to trim staff they send to these meetings. So I suspect the people you're referring to may not even be at this meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, for the TTF that's not the case because it is the technology people who are running the remote participation and the interweb that we manage, though, you know, that is an important task.

ALAN GREENBERG: Point taken. I don't know whether we're further ahead after having this discussion. Gisella, you started off saying first let's go through the yellow sections. Why don't we let you finish that.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, if I may, Maureen who said why not have one ALAC working group session where they have updates, rather than taking whole sessions each, which, yes, perhaps we could have that in the agenda like we usually do, the quick update from each working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep.

GISELLA GRUBER: Which would make sense. And then, just before I go to the yellow sessions, just for the RALOs, I think so far, general consensus is that the RALOs didn't need to meet unless it was the region in which we were holding the meeting. So in this region we'll have the AFRALO

General Assembly, and then Tijani just needs clarification on the AFRALO African meeting and APRALO have already said that they're going to hold an informal lunch sessions, and that is to prepare for ICANN60, no doubt. So, coming back to the yellow sessions. So, we started off the community forum and proposed fundamental bylaw amendments, followed by the Next-Gen gTLD RDS policy requirement. Again, the Monday afternoon is two slots taken for that community session.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The GAC was asking to split that, is that being rejected?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Rejected, confirmed, no changes there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Then we've got the Empowered Community. Again, I've asked Tanzania for clarification of that first yellow slot on the Tuesday morning, but in the afternoon, we've got the GDPR and the Geographic Names. On Wednesday, the two afternoon sessions, Operational Side of ICANN, Ops Plan and Budget, and Who Sets ICANN Priorities. And last, but not least, on Thursday afternoon, taking two of the slots, is the Geographic Names. And just as an aside, the GAC has already contacted us for potential meeting on

Tuesday 10:30 to 11:15, with the whole of the ALAC and the whole of the GAC, for 45 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Only 45, okay.

GISELLA GRUBER: And I'm not sure how that kind of fits in with the block schedule, why we've only been given 45.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's carved out of their time, so they're presumably taking the other half hour of that session, or whatever, and saying that they'll want to do something else. Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So seeing this schedule now, does this mean that each one of the afternoon sessions that are in yellow need to be unconflicted?

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't know yet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I mean, I know you've made the point that basically if we do that, then many of our volunteers will have to do half days. I hope there are a lot of beautiful things to see in Johannesburg.

GISELLA GRUBER: Nope.

ALAN GREENBERG: We think, we think about half of them will be designated as non-conflicted, and half of these will be designated as 'you can schedule.' We don't know which are which, and I'm getting tired of speaking at meetings where my comments are completely ignored, and somebody else's comments are the ones that get written down as the decision, I'm just noting that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And just as a followup, then, Alan, if one decides, because I guess most of the rooms will then be empty at an ICANN meeting during the unconflicted things, if one decides to run an informal meeting, what is the penalty? Do you get electrified? Shot? Or do you put in the corner and have to say I'm a bad boy or bad girl?

ALAN GREENBERG: You won't have technical and remote support.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, well, that's fine. Still continue running the meeting. I don't know, it's bizarre. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe they'll shut off the power in the room so you can't do that, I don't know. That might be a joke, or it might be serious.

GISELLA GRUBER: Well, you'll probably get power cut, but that has nothing to do with ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, you'll get what?

GISELLA GRUBER: The power cut. Non-scheduled power cuts in Johannesburg...

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, can we continue this, this meeting is going to go on until we finish, I'm giving you fair warning.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, sorry, just an updated, in the latest session, this is the latest block schedule, Tanzania sent it to me 30 seconds ago.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so how is this different from the last one?

GISELLA GRUBER: Not only that, but I've also said which need to be unconflicted, to which I haven't yet had a response. "A rejection action petition is ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Please don't scroll while we're trying to read it.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, sorry, they're giving you scrolling rights, my apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so rejection petition, that's the session, a cross community session to say was the CCWG crazy or not. Did they come up with bylaws that can never work? The answer is yes, but it's too late now, so why are we going to have a discussion about it? Alright, sorry, back to you Gisella, my rant is over on that one.

GISELLA GRUBER: So, as I said, as soon as I know which sessions are conflicting or not, I will let you know, which will help us with the scheduling, as well. We've got to have a response by tomorrow. I wanted the planning maybe to have a quick call tomorrow just to get a good start on this, because we won't have much time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, oh, there have been significant changes. The Rejection Action is now on Monday, it's the community forum anymore, and note that the session on New gTLD RDS, sorry, the Next-Generation RDS has no blue

beside it, it's unconflicted, they've decided that already. The community forum which is now Tuesday, it's against Outreach, so not many people will have to go to it, that makes some sense. The GDFR, GDFR? Does anyone know what those initials mean?

GISELLA GRUBER: GDPR.

ALAN GREENBERG: GDPR, okay, does that help anyone? Global Domain Petitioning Requirement. Good dinner something or other, come on, we're inventing – okay, whatever it is, we can't schedule anything against it, it is so important, we don't know what it is, but it is so important. Okay, it's part of Geographic Names. It's the gTLD Something PR, Geographic Names. That's a two part session I think.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, I've got an update on the conflicting sessions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, is it different from what the chart says?

GISELLA GRUBER: Well, Tanzania is just going to send this out to the group and there will be an email attachment with it, probably giving a little bit more, but all she's saying now is that, "All of the cross community sessions in yellow are intended to be with little to no conflict, but I don't intend to forbid

you from scheduling if you want to. So the GAC and ccNSO have decided to conflict when they deem appropriate."

ALAN GREENBERG: So they're allowed to do it, but we're not. Therefore we are now allowed to do it. Okay. Good.

GISELLA GRUBER: Well, it might have been further to your intervention on one of the calls saying, you know, it really should be up to us, I think we're all big enough and old enough to decide this.

ALAN GREENBERG: But they have implicitly told us which ones are REALLY non-conflicted by not scheduling any blue boxes beside them. Notice the difference between some of them that have blue boxes, oh, actually, that's not true. Yeah, some of them have boxes beside them, some of them don't. I don't really know. Let's finish the list of them, please, and then we can go on to something else, because we're already almost an hour-and-a-half into this meeting.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay, we've been through – let's see what the email says when the final schedule comes out, and I think there will be some guidance there, and then I think what we need to do as soon as possible, as soon as really possible, is just to decide on the ALAC side, if it is true that none have to be unconflicted, that we can at least decide which ones we think that

At-Large members should attend. And I see that Heidi has got her hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, I'm very conscious of the time now, and also your deadlines. So do you wish to have a call of the meeting group tomorrow so you can start working on these meeting forums? Can we get an agreement that some of these policy meetings will be within the At-Large leadership sessions as working group updates? So, we do know that we have a certain number of slots for the working groups, just so we can make some decisions today.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let me go through the yellow ones, and I'll tell you which ones I think we will honor not conflicting with. Because I think they are topics of interest. May I do that? I'll take no objection as a positive. RDS I believe we can reasonably say is a non-conflicted one that we will not go against. Geographic Names, we will not go against. Operational Side of ICANN Ops Plan and Budget. I don't even know what that means, so we're going to have to decide when we understand more about it. Who Sets ICANN's Priorities? I thought someone had vetoed that as not being a policy issue, I don't know, any thoughts on whether we conflict with that? Process Flow session. I don't even know what that means in this context. And Geographic Names, yet another Geographic Names? So we now have six hours of Geographic Names, okay. And that's it.

GISELLA GRUBER: And GDPR?

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't know what it is. Olivier thinks is good dinner place recommendations, and I thought something, there was another one about beer.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: May I say, it's Olivier speaking, actually, no, I was looking at GDPR, so that's the General Data Protection Regulation, which replaces the 1995 EU Directive with regards to protection of data, and this I believe is to do with the waivers that ICANN keeps on providing the individual registries, so this one is...

ALAN GREENBERG: It probably also regards the RDS and what rules we are allowed to make.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. It's a lawyer's beat.

ALAN GREENBERG: There was a really good session with privacy commissioners at the last meeting, which we didn't get to.

GISELLA GRUBER: I did.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't. Alright, I think we're going to need a little bit more description of what some of these meetings are before deciding. One thing we have said a number of times in this meeting, many times this meeting, we need to have more of our sessions focusing on policy issues. I would like via email from this group in the next day or two, this is an action item on everyone, to identify topics that are deemed to be policy and suggestions for who is going to run the session. If I am to say we need five sessions on policy, we actually need topics and people to put them together – it's a curious thing about that.

GISELLA GRUBER: This one is done, yay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, any other topics on general meeting scheduling at this point. We are 15 minutes before the end of the meeting, and we still have some substantial things to discuss.

GISELLA GRUBER: I just got a quick update, Alan, that we've got a request from the ALT to meet with CSG, and that is potentially on Wednesday for a lunch sessions, and wanting to know whether the ALT with which we should meet with the registry stakeholder group, which didn't happen in Copenhagen.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm happy to meet with them – despite what they wrote about us in the At-Large Review comments.

GISELLA GRUBER: And any other group anyone thinks we should be meeting with, either ALT or ALAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have had periodic discussions with Intellectual Property and with the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group, and with Business Constituency, so – not Noncommercial Stakeholder Group, the Noncontracted Parties House. So we can choose to wait for them to contact us, or we can try to contact them. There's only a limited number of lunches that are available, however.

GISELLA GRUBER: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: SSAC will request a meeting, we will be delighted to meet with SSAC.

GISELLA GRUBER: The meeting with the CSG is actually Greg with the BC-IST, IPC, that's the CSG – Staff support just gave me a few of the people who are on that, so I will continue with that. Thank you. I've also asked Tanzania in a quick chat if we can get a little bit more substance to what the meetings are, and she sent through the topic proposals, so I'll send that

straight to you, where it gives a description of each of these sessions that they've put forward. You might remember the document.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't, but I believe I've seen it. Maureen, do they want to meet with us after, now that we've rejected the EPSRV Report?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, I'm wondering about that. This is Maureen for the record. I think we could request a meeting and just let them know that we still want to be friends.

GISELLA GRUBER: Do we?

ALAN GREENBERG: I want, well, they may not want to be friends. Does this count as a policy meeting if we meet with other groups that do policy? I think we get in under the window, because the SO by definition, is a policy group, therefore by definition, regardless of what we talk about with them, it's policy. That's my position, and I'm standing by it.

GISELLA GRUBER: ALAC with SSAC and ALAC with ccNSO concerned...

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know, SSAC is an advisory committee, they don't do policy.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, you're brave.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh god, I'm in my slap happy mode at this point, I give you fair warning. Olivier you have your hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. A couple of things. So we haven't had a meeting with the address supporting organization in a while, but in a short meeting such as this one, it probably is in the best use of time, may I suggest...

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it's probably a great use of their time, because they're not allowed to do anything at this meeting, it falls under the role of policy.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well, then I would suggest perhaps it to be a good idea to have a meeting with the ASO at the last meeting of the year during the AGM, where there's a little bit more time, plus I think that by then it might well be that all the RALOs will have signed an MOU with their respective regional internet registries, which is something that a few years ago started, I think it was APRALO that started it off, and it seems that it has taken hold, and I think we have a few things to be quite happy about this year, especially the NARALO meeting having taken place, et cetera,

and I'm working at the moment for what looks to be the last of the RALOs to sign up, which will be EURALO, to sign at the last meeting of the year. So that was one thing.

The second thing is wearing a different hat. And I don't think you've been copied on these discussions, but I've been asking Tanzania with regards to sessions for the cross community working group on internet governance. As you know, the ALAC is a cochartering organization along with the ccNSO and the GNSO, and it was a bit unclear as to how a face to face meeting, meeting room could be worked on, or could be asked for. The answer from Tanzania was that it's got to be asked through at least one of the chartering organizations. So I don't know whether you want to ask Gisella to ask for a room or something. Not necessarily the ALAC room, but it's got to be a room. But then I have no idea where that would fit in the schedule. So, perhaps Gisella could ask where such a place would be possible, that would be helpful, too.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, it's either going to be, you, once you see the list of the comments meetings, the yellow meetings, let us know if you think it would be acceptable in any of those slots. But chances are if we request it, it's going to come out of one of our meeting slots. So, are we willing to give up an hour-and-a-half slot or whatever, an hour-and-a-quarter slot, to allow that meeting to be held? But the real question is...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

It wasn't marketed as such, though...

ALAN GREENBERG: ... Olivier, let me finish, if you want it to be attended by other people, however, you really have to consider everyone else's schedule, as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's indeed correct. So the way that we did last time, was to have a look at maybe five different slots, and then do a Doodle on the five different slots. We probably have to follow that path, as well, again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's see how many policy meetings we can come up, and then we'll have to decide on the fly. You will get involved, that's all I can say right now. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. For the record, the first MOU signed between NARALO and RIR was between AFRALO and AFRANIC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it was, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry for making that mistake, Olivier speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, back to you, if you still have anything to do on the general scheduling.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, if you agree, I think we should have a quick call with the planning committee tomorrow, to check if everyone is available.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine, social items.

GISELLA GRUBER: And I will send around to the ALT list more detail on each of the cross community sessions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Item B, social activities and logistics.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alan, sorry, very sorry to come on to this, but can we please have a deadline, did you already give a deadline for those five topics, so we can, we really need to move forward on these.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know, what is the action item say?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: How about Monday, or May 2nd at the very latest? Because we really need to know on these.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine, done.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, okay, perfect. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Social activities.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alan, I know that we're running out of time, I didn't have an update yet at this stage.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine. Logistics?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No update.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I do note that one of the hotels is half the price of the others. The reviews seem to indicate there is a slight reason for that. I do hope that we will be put in one of the good hotels. And Tijani, do you believe it is essential, and I say essential, that all of the AFRALO people be in the

same hotel as well as ALAC? All of the hotels are within a block or so of the convention center, I believe.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan, for asking. I think the closer they are the best it is. Last time, if you remember, it was a big problem. And yet, I didn't want to stay with ALT in the other hotel, I was with the ALSs in their hotel. This time I hope that we will be all together in the same hotel. We had a bad experience in Dakar, we don't want it to be done a second time.

ALAN GREENBERG: The only hotels listed on the ICANN website right now are all literally either connected to the convention center, or directly adjacent to it. So we are not looking at anything which is... pardon me?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, yes, correct. All the hotels are close by.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, in this case, there is no problem, we can be in any hotel, since we are all connected to the convention center.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, I mean, if ICANN starts placing people 17 miles away, that's a different issue, but for security reasons, I believe all ICANN attendees, certainly the funded attendees, are going to be within the perimeter of these hotels, as far as I know. They're not even advertising any other hotels on their website right now. That implies the total number of people that are expecting is under 1000 people, because the hotels can only hold 1000 people. So I'm not quite sure what that means. I would like to try to make sure that we are housed in a reasonable hotel, however, at least the people who are long-timers in ICANN, and I trust Gisella and Heidi will take note of that. AFRALO General Assembly, is there anything we need to talk about at this point?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Tijani speaking. I don't think there is something special to say now. We'll have an organizing committee very soon, I think it is in the next week. We already prepared a lot of things between meetings and I think that for capacity building we have more or less our program. For the general assembly we have more or less the agenda, but this is not the most important point, the most important point is to have the content already, and I think we have a good content now. For the social event, we are not very advanced, I think that we have to work on it seriously very soon. So that is it. Yes, the local community engagement, we have good, how to say, good contacts, and I think one week or two, we will have something defined and I can speak to you about it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Item D, ALT Strategy Meeting. In case anyone is unaware of it, that meeting is on, Julie has said she has to leave slightly early, because her flight was already booked, and we will work our schedule around that. At this point I am presuming that everybody else will be there at the meeting and will be able to stay until at least the noon hour. If that is not the case, please talk to me and Staff, not this second, but very immediately, because we have to fix the problem if there is a problem.

Pre-ICANN meetings. You're probably not aware, because the decision was just made, and the final details have not been announced. As you know, there will be a CCWG meeting on the Sunday preceding the meeting. There will also likely be a CCT Review Team meeting on the Saturday and Sunday, an SSR Review Team meeting on the Saturday and Sunday, and an RDS Review Team meeting possibly one or more likely two days, also on the Saturday and Sunday. Those people involved in any of those things, good luck.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

RDS? Is RDS going to meet two days?

ALAN GREENBERG:

We don't know I have suggested that one day would be enough. That one day will likely be Sunday, in conflict with the other meetings, which some of us may have to go to, who may be on it. It's going to interesting, is all I can say. On the other hand, they could have been scheduled in the middle of the week, taking two days out of the full week.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's true.

ALAN GREENBERG: All of them. That's as it stands. That was as of a meeting yesterday. Exactly how that will unfold, I believe that was a decision made, but until I see it in writing, I will not guarantee that. Anything else on ICANN59? Last call. "One word for it, Alan." Would you like to share what that one word is, Cheryl? Bloody hell is two words.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it starts with a C.

ALAN GREENBERG: With a C? I'm not sure I know which word you're talking about.
[CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go with Julie's version in chat, that's probably safer, and I'll get back to closed generics in my other ear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, I do want to know what your censored C word is, though, okay. Next item, update on fiscal year requests. We don't really want to do that now, do we?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's one issue on fiscal year...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a 30 second update.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, a 30 second update.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Not even that, 15 seconds, for those people who were not on the call today, this is just a quick update from what we heard on the ALAC call. So we had a special purpose call of the subcommittee on outreach and engagement earlier today, just went over the plans for the requests, the workshop requests. The three RALOs will be submitting requests, the ALAC/subcommittee on outreach and engagement will not, they will be working more toward getting a separate booth for everyone who's going to be there.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're talking about the IGF, by the way, right?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, sorry, that's the IGF request, yes. And then an hour later, we had a call of the FCSC and we heard from Rob Hogarth, and I think a lot of

clarification was given on some of the concerns that were raised during the ALAC meeting about the CROPP, some of the inconsistencies that we've had in the responses. So I think that Rob has taken that on board, and that's where we are right now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, your estimate of 15 seconds is way out of kilter. Alright, one item related to finance and budget. One of the items in the statement that Tijani has drafted is that we support the extension of the CCWG Accountability Budget into fiscal year 18. That is not any addition of the budget, but it's permission to carry unspent budget from this year into next. There was a strong statement, two of them so far, by Christopher Wilkinson, saying he thinks that is really ill advised and people are getting tired and a lot of true things. I suggested that if we have any caveat to our acceptance, that it simply be that we don't expect the CCWG to require another extension.

We have today been asked by the CCWG whether as a chartering organization, we support the extension. Since our finance and budget comment is due tomorrow, I do not think have the opportunity to consult with the ALAC. I will send a message out tonight, but there will not be a lot of time to actually get any feedback. I am asking a question of the ALT, and I am specifically targeting the five members of the ALT, Leon has left, so someone is going to have to get a hold of him and ask him the question, but we know his answer because of his role as co-chair.

LEON SANCHEZ: I am here.

ALAN GREENBERG: You are here! Ah, I was told you left.

LEON SANCHEZ: I'm on the phone bridge.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did not know that. So we have been asked, are we supporting the extension or not? Does the ALT recommend, I'm not asking the ALT to make a decision, does the ALT recommend to the ALAC that we support the extension either with no reservation, with my comment, "but don't do it again," or with Christopher's much stronger statement about how we should handle the CCWG going forward into this fiscal year. I would like to go round robin among the other four members of the ALT and how, if at all, are you supporting and do you recommend to the ALAC to support? I personally am supporting it, and I am willing the caveat of don't extend again. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Alan. I agree completely with you. I would recommend supporting the extension, but with the caveat that we say we don't expect another extension.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I agree with both of you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Andrei?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: I support the extension.

ALAN GREENBERG: Support the extension with the caveat of don't extend again?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Don't extend again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Monitor the process and make sure you don't extend again. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, I think that we have to support the extension. What about if for example the jurisdiction cannot come to closure or resolution? What will happen? Shall we get rid of this discussion and this obligation that we have from Workstream I because we don't want to extend it for more time?

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you remember that we actually finished the IANA transition and the accountability because we had a deadline?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know, yeah, I know. I didn't forget, I know, I didn't forget. But, Alan, I am asking a serious question.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I will give you a serious answer. If the group, we've come to the point where we are at the end of fiscal year 18, which is about 6 months after we are currently predicting it will end.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we have not finished, and we believe we will ever finish, then you can continue working without a budget. I don't want, look, our caveat of saying don't extend again has no power of law, it is not enforceable, all we are saying is the CCWG should be monitoring things, and keep control. That doesn't mean they win.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

LEON SANCHEZ: Do you realize that you're actually supposed to work without a payment? Is that actually possible?

ALAN GREENBERG: Without what? A payment? No, I'm saying they'll have to work without a face to face meeting, and without legal support.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Contractual requirements are countered by it, you know that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Look, if we have not finished this by next July, which is 14 months from now, boy are we in trouble.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: We are in trouble, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then, fine. We have survived without resolving the jurisdiction problem until now, we will survive going forward. Okay, before we get side tracked on jurisdiction, we have now decided to recommend to the ALAC that this be accepted. I will put it to the ALAC, but I feel comfortable enough that we will put it in the finance and budget statement and say it will be ratified. That was all I was looking for. I thank you. I have nothing else under item Budget.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: In a moment, in a moment, Tijani. We will not do item number 8 on review of the ALAC meeting and we have had no request for any other business. Tijani, you are between us and the meeting being over. I turn the microphone over to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. So you propose that we keep it in the statement?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are keeping the short caveat, and I haven't looked at what you have in your statement, but I'll send you a message as soon as I get off the phone, to say whether I think the wording is good or needs changing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, very good. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else folks? Then thank you very much for having this short meeting that has only run 8 minutes over. I sort of hoped it would be under an hour, but I'm naïve some days. And wish us all good luck on the scheduling, it's not going to be fun. And thank you Maureen for volunteering to take responsibility for the gTLD whatever it was, CC2. Sorry, my mind has turned to mush at this point and I freely admit it.

Thank you all, have a good weekend, and we'll talk by and by. And those of us who are doing scheduling, apparently we're meeting tomorrow. Bye bye.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you everything, the meeting has been adjourned, and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call, and wishing you a good morning, good night, or good afternoon. Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]