

---

MARIO ALEMAN:

Thank you, Alan. It is Mario once again managing the call. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the ALAC leadership team mid-monthly call on Thursday, 11<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at 19:30 UTC. On the call we have today Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Holly Raiche, Andrei Kolesnikov, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, Maureen Hilyard. And we have apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond. And on the staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Ariel Liang, Yeşim Nazlar, Evin Erdoğan, and myself Mario. And I will be doing the call management.

We have listed apologies from Olivier, as I mentioned before and we have no interpreter for this call. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking not only for transcription purposes, but also for our translators. For this, I would like to turn it back over to you, Alan. If you could please begin the call.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We have a relatively packed agenda, and is there anyone who has anything for any other business, or any other comments on the agenda? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we'll presume the agenda is accepted as presented. And we'll start, and the first substantive item is the policy development activities. And I will turn the call over to Ariel to review where we are in various many things that are going on.

---

*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.*

---

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Alan. This is Ariel speaking. For the first one is on the fundamental bylaws change to move the board governance committee's reconsideration process responsibility to another board committee. And just a reminder, we have a ratification vote going around, so please cast your vote and the statement has been sent to public comments. But I notice, Alan, you added a comment after the submission, so I'm wondering whether you want to do any changes to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I was suggesting that we didn't need to thank the board for doing something the bylaws required them to do. But it's there and it's not going to hurt. So we're just being more gracious than we needed to be.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, Thanks, Alan. So the second one is quite important it's on the competition, consumer trust and consumer choice review team draft report to adopt recommendations for new GTLDs. Holly has finalized a statement and through email she sent you Alan, León and Olivier for some final comments and check whether the draft has incorporated their input. So, Alan and León I guess, just a quick reminder on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will do that. It's on my list to do right after this call is over, or relatively soon thereafter. Unfortunately, I was somewhat occupied the rest of the day. León, have you had a chance? Or anyone else?

---

ARIEL LIANG: And I heard Holly--

HOLLY RAICHE: I finished my work on that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Next item, then.

ARIEL LIANG: The next one is on the deferral of country code names to reporting organization and review. So the draft team has been posted on the weekend. I invited all of you to take a look at the draft and comment by 15<sup>th</sup> of May. Next Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: So a quick reminder on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can't imagine it's going to be one of the more controversial ones, but we'll see.

ARIEL LIANG: Cheryl has raised her hand.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan, thanks Ariel. Cheryl for the record. It may not be controversial within our community, Alan, but I just wanted to let you all know that I would expect the GNSO to not be in favor of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. Just because they had to go through one and everyone else should too? Or some other reason?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's all about rigorously sticking to the bylaws in the conversation so far. But we shall see.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The bylaws do give discretion as I pointed out in my comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I note that in your comment, Alan. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Andrei, go ahead.

---

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Thank you very much. It's Andrei speaking. I talked to Katarina yesterday about the delay with the GSNO review. And I definitely view the load of words and things to do. They have to deal with. There is no other reason behind it, just planning of the resources and availability of the resources. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: They also say they plan to do some work in preparation for it, which should make the review better. If these reviews ended up in really making substantive improvements in a lot of parts of our organization, I would be far less likely to say "let's just defer". But the overall history is not really encouraging. Not so far anyway. And I'm not just talking about our review, I'm talking about the long history of them. So, what is what is. We'll see. I don't think the comment I drafted is going to be controversial for in our community. I hope not, anyway. But if it is, then we'll adjust. Maureen, go right ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry, Alan. I'm just preparing myself for the next one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Ariel, why don't you go on to the next one?

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. The next one is the one Maureen's leading. So, it's on the GNSO community comment to new GTLDs acceptance and procedures TTD. So I will let Maureen take the lead.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Maureen, I am very impressed by the number of names you have managed to add on to your process. It's a skill which I wish I had. Apparently I don't. Go right ahead. Tell us about it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Maureen, for the record. I must admit it's sort of been going along very slowly, but I have to applaud Andrei and Satish who are the first ones to actually complete their work track questions. The others are sort of like, I'm waiting on the legal beagles.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know, it's León and...

MAUREEN HILYARD: ... and Alberto's office to help as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll note Satish's name is not on the list.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, I know. And I did sort of like want to get his name on as Andrei and Satish have worked very hard on their questions, and I really wanted to get at least one of the work tracks completed. I mean, they haven't answered the question. And as Cheryl pointed out, it's not essential, but they've got some really comprehensive responses. And I think it's

---

actually cool. I seem to have lost touch with Evin for some reason, and I'm not quite sure how to get back to him.

ALAN GREENBERG: He's on Skype, so he's alive.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Is he?

ALAN GREENBERG: I've seen him comment on some chatter or other. I don't remember which one.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. Well he's not responding to any emails. So, I might try and see if you could actually sort of remind him that I'm trying to get a hold of him. Fabian and I will probably try to do some work on number one. But we still haven't found anyone to look at track number three, which has to do with string contention. So I thought we'll put out what we've got very shortly, and we'll work on it from there. It's just that it closes on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of May, and so it's a little bit tight.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I'm a little worried on the timing because some of these, no matter how much work people put into them, are likely to illicit comments negative and/or positive. And we need time to factor those in before

---

the submission date. String contention is one of my favorite topics, so if no one else will do anything--

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, there we go. You're hired. I'll put your name on the list.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Someone take it upon their To-Do list to remind me continually until I produce something.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, I'll do that. And I'll send you the links.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Maureen. Anything else? Andrei, go ahead, if Maureen was finished.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Yes.



---

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Yes, I do have technical questions and we discussed this with Maureen in the email. There's some questions in the subgroup four which really go beyond at-large end users, which is related to the business planning of the applicant and some other issues related mostly to the business functions. Since I had experience from the past, I put some working behind it, but my question is: Is it appropriate, is it correct, to put the command on the questions which are not related to at-large at all?

ALAN GREENBERG: From my perspective, it is correct if indeed people support what you're saying. If it is just you who thinks it and everyone else disagrees, or doesn't believe we should even say something, then maybe we omit it. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record. Let me assure you that it is absolutely within our remit to respond. I'm not going to argue one way or other best two agreements or otherwise of what you say about how we should respond. But it is within the remit. The rationale there is these are requirements, as you well know, in the current applicants guidebook, in terms of criteria that has to be met.

And, part of what we're going to be discussing in the subsequent procedures for new GTLDs PDP is what does or does not provide to a next iteration out of the old applicant guidebook into a new applicant guidebook if such a thing even exists. And to that end, we do need to have community feedback on how worthwhile and indeed if they have an opinion in what form such criteria or check listing is needing to be

---

looked at. So that's certainly within remit. I'd encourage you to do so.  
Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would argue that I could make a good case from a user perspective that people should be providing really strong detailed business cases and business plans and be held to them. Now that's something ICANN must not really want to do after its first experiences, but from a user perspective, that may well be a good thing. It'd certainly reduce the number of new TLDs. Andrei, go ahead.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

It's Andrei again. Well, that's the thing about this business planning stuff. No one, there is no single application which really hit the target. Most of them were just the projected numbers, very few of them were above the projected numbers. So if you really don't get the property in advance, your business model—what's the reason of asking? For stability purposes?

The only hard requirement which ICANN would have to demand is to show the sustainability of the operations and ability to continue your business, whatever you think of your numbers. That's actually what I put in the comments. What's the reason of business planning if it's not working? There was not a single case of that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I simply may have an interesting discussion there.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Back to you, Maureen, or to you Ariel, whoever's up next.

ARIEL LIANG: I think I'm up next. Thanks Maureen. Next one is on the recommendations to approve SO/AC accountability, and that public comment was assigned to Alan and Cheryl who are drafting a statement. Just a reminder that the close date is the 26<sup>th</sup> on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we drafted one? He asks innocently.

ARIEL LIANG: Let me just check.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I remember that Cheryl gave us some really good words.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm pretty sure Cheryl is not going to draft a statement on her own set of questions. But anyway.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I seem to remember there was some discussion that Cheryl had some good words and I said let's capture those from the extract. I don't remember if it was on this one or not.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, it is on this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: From the transcript. Did we capture them?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I think so. I think I sent Cheryl and you the—Yes, I think I did that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't you post them in the Wiki as Cheryl's comments during ALAC or ALT meeting or whatever it was. Then I can find it and I'll look at it.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Okay. So, should I go to the next one, then?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please.

ARIEL LIANG: The next one is on the proposed renewal of soft net registry agreement. So there have been a lot of comments on the Wiki and also on the

---

mailing list. And I think that initial recommendation from Maureen and Bastian is to not draft a statement on that, but I think the conversation has taken a different kind of course. So Maureen has raised her hand now on that. Let her speak.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I must admit I'm impressed by the flurry of comments that have come through, and that's great. And we will look at that, but it's not a priority at the moment. It's not due until the 30<sup>th</sup> of May. So I'm actually focusing on the other comments CC2 statements. But, there's definitely enough to look at it. I think what we'll do is look at the pricing things, as that seems to be the major issue. But, yes. I'll get back to that one later.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Thank you. I was rather pleased with the discussion also in that. I think it's the first time I can remember where there was a subsequent flurry of email on a policy issue instead of a procedural one. [CROSSTALK] Well no, I'm sorry, it's my job to go there on a regular basis. That's what they pay me the big bucks for. I don't really have a strong feeling. When I received the document as I said I would, I had no comments either.

Then I looked and saw that there was a comment from someone who often makes off-the-wall comments, but nevertheless—and one of his

---

comments was off-the-wall, specifically saying that the anti-trust organizations should look at the contract. And that's just not within our mandate to say it should happen. So it's an interesting comment, but it has no real effect on ICANN.

The other one was the pricing one, and I simply raised it to point out it had been noted, it wasn't a change, but it might be something that at-large wants to talk about. And the comments were somewhat divided. The real problem is, as the CCT review team has found out, we have no basis for knowing are they trying to gouge the public, or are they just trying to slowly get up to the market value?

And I really don't know. And one could make an argument for making a comment and an argument for not making a comment. And I thought it was an interesting discussion. I didn't try to balance the comments and see which side "won" so-to-speak. I'll leave that to Maureen. But that was an interesting discussion. Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Sorry I'm muting myself. No, I think that it was good that the discussion has given us something else to focus on. I think because there was such a discussion that this needs to be included into some sort of statement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, well. Or not. As I said, an argument can be made that they're not up to dot org levels yet. And it is a relatively specialized TLD, so it may be totally reasonable. It's just, as I said, its' a good discussions to have.

---

I'm not quite sure where the end point is. But I'll leave it up to you.  
Back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Alan. So there are two new public comments just come out. The first one is on the revised ICANN procedure for handling Who Is conflicts property law, process and next steps.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh my God.

ARIEL LIANG: And that will close on June the 12th. And the other new public comment is on the draft framework interpretation for human rights. That will close on June the 16<sup>th</sup>.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. The first one is something that we were actually supposed to make a statement to the board, and I never got around to finishing the work with Roberto on that. Saying, "Get real. What we're doing is stupid." And they've decided to get real. Or at least I hope they have. Someone who is familiar with European privacy rights-- because that's the largest focus of it right now, although they're not the only place where there are privacy law issues—someone should look at it and try to get a feel for is what they're proposing reasonable, or is it another shambles? And if anyone has a candidate of someone who is versed on these kind of things, I would appreciate trying to wrestle them into it.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: It might just be me, but am I hearing somebody say, Holly, why isn't your hand up? Because I can't get into the computer.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't actually say that. I said since the focus is often on Europe, maybe we can get someone from Europe to participate. But Holly, if you'd like to volunteer, I won't stop you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Now, my comment on this. I sat on the working group, and I have to say, it was almost as productive as the RDS working group now. Almost.

ALAN GREENBERG: You mean there's a less productive one than the RDS working group?

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, I'm suggesting that's a possibility. They didn't come up with a solution. They've run right against the same problems everything else does. Look, I will have a look. I looked at it and thought, I will have a look and see if they've done any better. And I'm really unconvinced. But, I'm happy to hold the pen on that one and find anybody else who's interested in European—and it's not just European privacy law, I mean, for God sakes, China just introduced privacy legislation--



---

ALAN GREENBERG: No, but they mean the vocal ones with the prior practice.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know. I know. All right. Look, I'll have a look and see if it's worth commenting, frankly. Other than my usual which is: We have to resolve the fundamental issues, folks.

ALAN GREENBERG: No comment. Okay. Holly's name is down. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG: That's also in the public comment. It just crossed my mind and I also mentioned the --

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, no. It's not that. It's, there's a human rights...

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, that's the other new public comments and there's (inaudible) interpretation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any suggestions on who we ask on this one? Or throw it out to the At-Large in general? Tatiana's the point person that has been most interested in human rights who occasionally works with us. But if someone else has a thought? Heidi, go ahead.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, Alan, this is Heidi. My point was on the Fiscal Year 18 budget, just to give a quick update.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, let's finish on the human rights thing. Have you sent a message out to any of the lists about the human rights one yet?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I sent it to the IANA Issues working group. But do you want the Article 19 ALS to be involved in this? And actually, Niels is very active in that sub-group, so I don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can certainly ask him and Tatiana if she has any interest in providing input to the process. At least a comment on the Wiki. But they're leaders in the group, so again, we have people commenting on their own work. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I think that the people who are not on the working group, on the sub-group, should prepare something, and then people on the the sub-group can comment or can add their point of view. As for Article 19, the Chair of the sub-group is Article 19, so I do prefer not focus on them, they may contribute as everyone, but I prefer that someone from ALAC who is not a member of

---

the sub-group take the pen and lead the drafting, and then everyone can comment or can give their opinion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think we all prefer that. Do we have any volunteers? Do we know anyone who we can identify that might try to lead that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think Olivier would be a good choice.

ALAN GREENBERG: And since he's not on this call. Ariel, send a note to Olivier, copy the ALT, saying he was suggested as the lead for this, is he willing to take it on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And we will all work with him. I will work with him and all the members of the sub-group should work with him.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, this is Heidi. Back to the recently submitted ALAC statement on the Fiscal Year 18. Normally finance staff like to have calls with the community who have committed comments, just to ask any questions. But in this case, apparently, the ALAC statement was so clear that they

---

are double checking if there are any questions for a follow up call. So, Alan and Tijani, we'll get back to you maybe tomorrow to see if they do wish to have a call.

ALAN GREENBERG: If it's that clear to them, it's going to be easy to say no to, or easy to say yes to?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That I don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, let us know. It's nice to know that we can draft clear statements that are understandable. Ariel, anything else?

ARIEL LIANG: That's it for public comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Next item is updates from liaisons, if there are any. We are at the end of the time allowed for that right now, but if any liaisons have any comments, please feel free. Yrjö, go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, this is Yrjö Länsipuro, hi. There is a time slot found for the ALAC/GAC meeting in Johannesburg, Tuesday 27 June. That means that we need to have an agenda. We have some items. Of course, there are

---

a few that we can continue on from previous meetings, but I just want to ask everybody on this ALT and ALAC to come up with their thoughts, what is there to discuss with the GAC now? And of course, I'll try to find out from the GAC what they want to talk about. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There was supposed to be a meeting with the ALT and I presume the GAC Chairs and Vice-Chairs, is that likely to be rescheduled at this point? Or are we just going to give up and try to do it with emails?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: There was a time for that and it was canceled.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was canceled because Thomas was called away.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, it's Gisella, if I may?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Gisella, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much, Alan. Gisella for the transcript. Yes, it was cancelled, but a new Doodle poll has been sent out. It was sent out by Gulden Tepe and she sent out actually a reminder today at 18:12 UTC.

---

So, if you'd be so kind as to look in your inboxes and if you haven't yet completed the Doodle polls, to please do so. Thank you. And I will put it in the ALT Skype chat. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl for the record. Just briefly on GNSO. Two things I wanted to raise the attention to the ALT on. One is almost an aside. The next meeting of Council's on the 18<sup>th</sup> of May at 12h00 UTC. The (consent? - 00:30:16) agenda on that is noting and acknowledging Matthew Shears as a selection for seat 14 on the ICANN board. You all know about that anyway. And the other matter is the validation of the Work Stream II extension for funding for FY18. They are having one vote, the rest is discussion. One vote in term of approval of GNSO Council's review of the GAC communique, which is all fine and dandy but very, shall we say, disconnected, and recognized disconnected, because they're talking about the Copenhagen communique.

So the GNSO is looking at how it can perhaps get in closer synchronicity on all that. What I did want to mention though was that intersessionally they've held an online vote, which is a particular ability rarely exercised within GNSO Council as far as I can ascertain. But they do exist and they've just finished one. And that was to do with the International Red Cross/Red Crescent Society names of 20 possible voters.

---

All but one has voted and everyone to date is in favor so it will be resolved in both houses, as required, that the PDP working group on this matter be reconvened to look specifically at protection of full matching of names and to take into account their deliberative interactions that they had in the Copenhagen meeting. So that will require going out to a 30-day comment after the close of the reconvening of the PDP. So we will be asked to put something in as the ALAC in response to that at that time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. When will that PDP be reconvened?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The resolution has literally just been announced. The ink is hardly dry, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A question. We went to great pains to design new processes which could be used to reconsider PDPs, but now we are reconvening it, which I believe is not one of those processes. Is that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is the reconvened under the existing GNSO Council Bylaws, so you are correct. Whether it could have been done under the new arrangements did not even come into the approved resolutions and, again, it really depends on what is proposed as a motion as to what gets

---

through in a resolution. But it's operating under its ability to run under its policy development processes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I wasn't aware there was a reconvene clause but I don't really want to debate that now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can bore you with the details but I shan't.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Gisella and Heidi, are those old hands or new hands? I'm presuming they're old hands then. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. I wanted to come back to the issue of the GAC. It's right that it was canceled, the call, but now there is a new one, as Gisella said. And I thought that this call was to prepare our meeting in Johannesburg, but it is not bad to prepare ourselves before the call so that we have subjects or topics to present at the call. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any further comments on reports? Then we'll go on to the next item is At-Large Review. I will turn it over for a few minutes to Holly and/or Cheryl. And then I have a document to display that I want to talk about for two minutes, before we go on to the next item. Holly or Cheryl?



---

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't think either of us has much to say at this stage. What the next step is basically for the leadership team of the working party to get together to come up with a new timetable on the tasks that are ahead of us. We've now reached the stage where, yes, there is a final report. We've all had a look at it. And from hereon in really there's no more interactions with ITEMS, there has to be an interaction between us and the organizational committee and the board.

And so it's over to the three of us to set out a timetable, probably with Larissa and Lars, and we've asked for a brief meeting to do that. So, we're really kind of at the end of one part of the task and it's the beginning of a new.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My recollection is the original target was we should have our input into the OEC sometime in the early September timeframe. Is that correct or am I imagining it?

HOLLY RAICHE: That's what I want to check. I want to check with Larissa and see what their expectations are. Lars said there were some templates we could have a look at. I want to see if we could have a look at those. I just think there's a bit of an organizational mess.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: It's quite clear in my mind we do not want this to go past the end of the Annual General Meeting. We would like this to be finished under the same OEC that has been involved in the current processes. So, I think September's about as late. Now, for the GNSO, they convened within a week or so, adopted the GNSO recommendations, passed them onto the board, and the board adopted them very quick.

They then took nine months to send a letter saying they had done that but they actually went through the process exceedingly quickly, and I'm expecting them to do something similar with us. But nevertheless, I don't want to let it drag much past the September timeframe.

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't think it's going to be an easy path because, as we're all aware, we don't accept some of the major recommendations. We may accept that there might be an issue but their solution is not acceptable, and so we're going to have to craft something that says, these are the things that we accept, these are the things where we think there's an issue, we don't accept their solution to the issue, and these are the things where we don't think there's a problem. That's what we've got to go through.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I agree. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, Holly. Cheryl for the record. Look, I agree absolutely, Alan. And I think September is similar in my memory banks, but we may have shifted that when we shifted timelines earlier so we

---

do need to check. And I can't check that link, obviously, because I use Android systems, but if someone else could that would be great. I certainly can't see that allowing the dust to settle on this for a couple of weeks is a terrible thing.

I think we do need to have a full, frank and fearless discussion, as I suggested we would probably need to during our meeting in Johannesburg, despite the fact that it would be navel gazing and it's a policy meeting. I raised that as expected before, it was agreed that, yes, it is a (inaudible) but it is what it is. It's not our fault that in the (inaudible) such public commentary and final reporting happens to match with what is deemed a policy meeting as opposed to something that isn't a policy meeting.

So, I did raise that with Lars and co to perhaps look at in future timelines. But I would encourage us to have a good conversation but not a ad nauseam one during the Joburg meeting at some point. I think it's very doable in a July/August/September timeframe. I'm less concerned than Holly is about a difficult passage through, because I think one of the things that we may in fact want to encourage our response to include is to remind the board—not that I think we'll need to remind the current Chair of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee—is that of course ICANN hires its consultants to shine a light upon issues. They are not a constituency nor a client or member that needs to be taken further than our thanks for them shining such a light on things.

So, there is not requirement for the board to accept anything that a external examiner, an independent examiner, suggests. It is a mere

---

---

process and part of a tool kit of improving operational effectiveness. So, we might be subtle about reminding them of that. And particularly because, yeah, we've got a couple of points of significant divergence, but they are only a couple of points of significant divergence. So, let the dust settle for a week or ten days, have our meeting, get our planning lines out and see if we can schedule something in Joburg. If not, then a special purpose call immediately after it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. A couple of things. There has been a discussion in the Operational Effectiveness Committee of changing the process and the process they're talking about now is a two-phase process, where the first step, the examiner identifies issues, but they are still including a second step, although as a separate phase—I'm not quite sure how they envision this working—where the examiner then comes back with recommendations.

So, I'm not quite sure how that's different from today but that's not going to affect us anyway for another N years so I'm not going to worry about it. I did have a discussion with Holly at one point, and I think Cheryl also, I'm not sure, about whether we should use the template that GNSO used and I wasn't quite happy with it, and I realized I didn't really know to what extent we were accepting or rejecting and why, so I did go through the recommendations and created a document. If you can pull up the PDF. I've attached it to this agenda in both XLS.doc and the PDF.

---

And my intent is to, once I read it through again, because I wrote this last night and I didn't necessarily think about it very much, and once I do another pass on it and anyone that has any comments are welcome to give them to me, I was planning to send it to the working party as my stab at where I think we stand on many of these issues.

And one of the things I got out of it was under the status, they weren't clear, accept/reject. Some of them were, but most of them were with accept in principle or because how they planned it was wrong, in my mind, or reject with some consideration, because although we're rejecting what they're saying there's some germs of ideas there that perhaps need to be salvaged.

So anyway, if anyone has any interest, you can go through it, I guess on the doc version which is the easiest to comment on, if you have any comments or thoughts, send them to me. But this was not done as a working party project but just as my own attempt to get my head around where we were on these, so you might find it interesting, if you choose.

HOLLY RAICHE: If you could send that out, that would be great.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's attached to the agenda, just pull it down.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, my computer is basically still being isolationist, thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

If staff can send Holly a copy or send the ALT all three copies, I don't care. I did it in XL and then realized you can't really comment in XL so I converted it to a doc. And that's all I have. It was an interesting exercise. It didn't take me very long, but it was really interesting because our answers are more subtle than I expected on some of them and not nearly as clear as yes/no. Which was what was bugging me when I was looking at the GNSO template as to whether it was acceptable or not, and this confirmed that we need something a little bit more nuanced than that.

But anyway, that's just my take on it. Any comments on any of this? And I agree with Cheryl, a breathing period, even though I did this I'm not encouraging everyone to start actively working. I think we need a bit of a cooling down period. I did note that I was rather surprised that one of the recommendations has changed completely from the original version. I realized much of the change had happened in the previous draft that I hadn't noted. And that was on the travel funding one.

The original recommendation was basically saying, post how much money these (inaudible) are getting so everyone can know. The last draft we commented on I hadn't even noticed that they really had changed it. They changed it more this time to basically say, advertise what funding is available and, by the way, say who has been on these trips on the past. And that is what they said in the last draft although I hadn't really picked up on it. I think it's one of these ideas that's rather interesting and completely impractical.

---

What they're saying is we should replicate on the At-Large site information about all the other funding programs and reporting on the other funding programs. And the concept of replicating things and keeping them in sync on multiple websites scares the somethings out of me. So, it's an interesting idea and we do need to make information more available, although I think their specific implementation is all wrong. But that goes along with a lot of the things. Any further comments before we go on to the next agenda item? And we are, as I said, somewhat late at this point, but not a lot. Nothing else.

Empowered Community then. Can we bring up the document? Now, as you're aware, the GNSO Chairs sent out a message saying they have selected Matthew Shears and the Empowered Community had to act on it. That reminded us that we never sent out such a letter for Leon, and that has now been done. But in reviewing it, I also note that nobody did this to appoint the whole board effective the day of the transitions.

So, none of these Directors are really seated appropriately, that under today's rules they have not been appointed by the designator. That notwithstanding, it dawned on me that we have a paradox problem in that the definition of the Empowered Community Administration is, and if you look at the document that's on the screen now or it's attached to the agenda, 6.3(a) of the Bylaws, is the Empowered Community Administration is simply the collective name for the people.

So, there is no organization as such other than the people. Other aspects of the Bylaws explicitly say, and that's echoed by our Rules of Procedure, that the people can only act on direct instruction from their organization. That is, the Empowered Community representative has

---

no power other than to relay things. That is in direct conflict with other clauses in the Bylaws which say the Empowered Community must act to appoint the Directors selected by the NomCom or the ACs and SOs.

And it has no discretion to do that but it must do it. And since the Empowered Community Administration is just the people, and the people have been forbidden from taking any action on their own, we have an interesting situation. No one seems particularly concerned about it, but I think, and what has been suggested by Sam Eisner, is that if in our rules we identify that for specific things, and the things are the appointment of Directors and the removal of Directors by the board itself, where the Empowered Community does not have any discretion but must act, that if we simply deem this to have been approved by the ALAC then the Administrator can take the appropriate action and we're not in conflict.

And I'm going to be proposing, next time around, for our Rules of Procedure changes, a very short change, but I just wanted to give people a heads up as to why. Any comments? It's one of these interesting things that we didn't envision. Certainly there was no contemplation in the CCWG that the Empowered Community could deny appointing a Director if it was selected by the appropriate body, or refuse to take down a Director that the board had removed. But the wording that was there essentially gives them discretion to do that. So it's an interesting situation, I'm sure there are other things that we didn't foresee. Further comments before we go on?

Alright, next item is gTLD and Registration Issues working groups. As you all know we have been trying for ages to restart these groups.



---

We've gotten nowhere on Registration Issues. We thought we appointed Chairs for the gTLD working group and that essentially fell through for a number of reasons. And we have to fix this and I decided that I would start by drafting a mission statement for both of them. Again, this was done completely off the top without a lot of forethought.

What I would like is a volunteer from this group to take each of these, refine it as necessary, and then we as the ALT can present it to the ALAC and do a solicitation for membership. And hopefully from the membership we will find people who are willing to lead it. Doing it the other way around than the way we tried it last time. So, I'm opening the floor to comments on, is this a good thing to do? Am I starting off in the wrong direction? And if it is a good thing to do, can we have volunteers for each of the two issues? I have Cheryl and Tijani in the queue. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. Cheryl, not stepping forward as a volunteer, she'll hasten to add. I just want to take some pause with the At-Large New GTLD working group one. The mission is, by the way, fine. I'm concerned about the timing and the opportunity. Once the group input has happened, Maureen sent me two responses, once that's all come to bed and discussion has happened and the CC 2, the Community Consultation (inaudible) 2 have gone back to what is still a ongoing and rapidly running PDP process, right?

---

And this mission is designed to feed into a PDP process which, you know, the train's already left the station, let's say. I'm wondering whether that might be the ideal opportunity to reach out specifically to those people who've had what I trust will be a positive experience in this current CC2 drafting exercise and see if they cannot be the core, the nucleus, of the New gLTD working group to then feed in for the next step, and the next step, and the step after that.

And ideally, obviously, fits under this mission, also have occasional specifically proactive meetings where they can talk to those few of us who are engaged fully with the PDP and get a bit of facilitation up and down the line. I just think it's not so much a matter of pause on the mission, because I think that's fine, but pause on the timing of the mission exploration for this particular working group, from me, anyway. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. So, you're suggesting we've gotten Maureen to lure in these innocent people and now we use them as the core of the group? And I could probably continue with a fishing analogy but I won't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Let's not slap them until they've had a positive.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Understand. And this is not going to happen in a week so the timing sounds like it's probably pretty good. Tijani, go ahead.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. When do you want the work to be done? I mean the review of the Charter of the mission statement you prepared.

ALAN GREENBERG: I prepared them for the meeting today because there was a deadline and I didn't want to slip another month. And it would not be bad if we had these to present at the ALAC meeting which is in roughly two weeks from today, or two weeks minus two days I think, the 23<sup>rd</sup>, is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: In this case I cannot contribute because until Johannesburg, I cannot.

ALAN GREENBERG: First let's verify if that's when the ALAC meeting is. Do we have anyone from staff on the call?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I can just jump in. The problem with sending out a mission is having a mission without the group formed, I guess, that's my pause.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm happy to have the group redesign the mission. We just need something to get out there other than a title. So that's why I suggested,

---

you know, starting out with this. Yes, Tijani, I'm sorry, we'll go back to you now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, thank you. I remember when we started the IANA Transition, the CWG group, the Charter of the CWG group, I proposed to the group that we involve the group in drafting the Charter, and everyone said, on this drafting group, that it is better to draft the Charter out of the people who will be on the group. They said we don't need them to be on the drafting group because it is not necessary and it is better for them, I don't know why, but it is better for them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I don't want to spend a lot of time debating now whether the group can modify the mission once they are formed. Clearly, if the group approaches the ALAC and says, we would like to change it, and they have a rationale for whatever, I don't think we're going to dogmatically refuse. I just put this together because I thought we needed some paragraph describing what the group does if we're going to go look for volunteers.

So, at this point, if no one wants to work on it then we can just drop it and I'll put it into the circular bin. But if people think that it has some merit, and I'm assuming that there's going to be some changes, I rarely draft something that doesn't require some change, then I'd like to look for someone to help on this. I did this whole thing in 20 minutes, I don't think we're talking about hours and hours of work. Tijani said he can

---

work on it but not til after Johannesburg. That's essentially two months out at this point then.

Is anyone else interested in pursuing this right now? Or do we just dump it and say it was an interesting experience. I really think, especially given the comments from the review, that by the time we submit our comments to the OEC, I think groups like this—remember, we're claiming we need these working groups because they are the interface between At-Large and the people working on the PDPs—I think if we're going to have some credibility we really need these groups operating and not having been defunct for three years. Andrei, go ahead.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

Thanks, this is Andrei speaking. Alan, I can input my experience in the previous New gTLD round to the working group or to the people who will (inaudible). Because I'm not a good writer or drafter, but I do have some experience, so if it's necessary, I can be a part of it. Or definitely a leader of it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I wasn't asking anyone to lead the final groups, I'm just looking for input on these documents as something to present to the ALAC and At-Large to start the discussion. So, there's both a doc and a PDF attached to the agenda. If you want to annotate it with any suggestions or comments on it, then I welcome that. Thank you. If anyone else has any interest then please forward them to us or to me. Is there a general belief this should be presented to the ALAC at this point, and after the

---

ALAC meeting presented to the larger group? Is there any objection to that? Okay, we have no input whatsoever, so, talk to me privately.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just read the chat, Alan. I put something in chat. If you want to interact, intervene and keep talking, but you know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Alright, not sure you see the urgency this month, that's fine. Let's let it ripen for a while and if we don't do it at the meeting this month, we will be bringing it up in Johannesburg. We need an opportunity for a face to face meeting to at least discuss it and this is policy. So, anyone has any thoughts, get them to me otherwise we'll just let it ripen for a while.

Next agenda item is At-Large at ICANN 59 and I'll turn it over to Gisella, or Heidi, or somebody.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It is Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry about that, Alan, just bear with me for a second, just as my computer's deciding to die. I'm going to put up the draft schedule further to our call earlier this week and there are questions. Sorry you didn't get it before but it's been filling the boxes. Just bear with me a second while I share the document with you. You'll see that I've put in

---

here the ALAC sessions. And Beran has joined us as well, thank you for joining us. Beran has joined the planning committee with Leon, Alan, Heidi and myself. So I'm going to give you scrolling rights, there you go. You can go wild over the four days.

So there are a few questions here. We have, and I've put as much information as I've been able to find on the other groups, the ccNSO, the GAC, the GNSO and RSSAC. I haven't had any input from SSAC yet just because I haven't seen the meeting forms submitted yet and I took all the information that I got on our internal schedule. So, if we just run through the days, you'll see that all the ALAC sessions are in yellow. The working group sessions unfortunately don't come out very well on this are in purple.

And let's just run through it day by day. So, Monday we're going to start at 9:15-10:15 working session—we're not going to start, this is a suggestion. ALAC working session. It's that ALAC and Regional Leaders working session to be exact and to have the full title. Then we've got another 90 minute session to follow that. And we will have after that, over the lunch, our first AFRALO Capacity Building session. To be followed then by another ALAC working session.

And we have our Cross-Community Non-Conflicting session in the afternoon for the two slots. Then in the evening we have our host event which is likely to be an external event location, yet to be confirmed. Tuesday we start the day off with AFRALO Capacity Building session number two. And that we'll be holding on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, the first hour of the day will be for the AFRALO Capacity Building sessions.

---

Then after that, for now, not yet in yellow, is an ALAC session for 60 minutes. We then go on to the GAC and ALAC session which is a 45 minute session in the GAC room. We then still have time to slip in an hour's working group. So the first suggestion there was to put the Outreach and Engagement sub-committee meeting there, just to have it earlier in the week as it is dealing with outreach and engagement, and if there's anything that they can work on, even though it's a policy forum, in Johannesburg, I placed it there. The 90 minutes Regional Secretariat's meeting is for the first slot of the afternoon.

And then we go on to the two Cross-Community sessions which are Non-Conflicting. And in the evening we've got the 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Fellowship Program. And possibly the (GEM's? - 01:04:59) music evening on that evening. Going on to the Wednesday and then it's going to be open for comments, unless you would like to say anything now? I don't see any hands in the AC room yet. On the Wednesday we have, again, AFRALO Capacity Building session to start with. And then we go on to the AFRALO General Assembly.

Now, the AFRALO did ask for two hours, so there's a one hour slot, followed by a coffee break, and then the second hour slot. It is going to be difficult to get anything else scheduled in after that time, so the question would be for AFRALO Leadership Team, if they would like to have an additional 30 minutes there, which would allow a little bit more leeway in the agenda. And then you'll see on the ALAC right hand column we've got the ALC and CSC lunch which will take place on the Wednesday.



---

My mistake there, we've got a whole slot from 13h30 to 15h00, which for some reason has not been filled but can be filled immediately with the ALAC session or a working group. And then I've sent an email to the Chairs of the working groups who are meeting in Johannesburg to find out, with these afternoon sessions, as in the operational side of ICANN's Ops Plan and Budget, as well as Who Sets ICANN Priorities, if there's anyone who has to attend those sessions, otherwise I would suggest running two working groups there.

Now, I have noted in the yellow box, Cheryl and Tijani attending the first cross-community session that day, and Cheryl has already confirmed that I believe that she'll be attending the Who Sets ICANN Priorities. So I've provisionally put TTF and Public Interest. Again, if we get the meeting room booked and blocked for our sessions, if we then need to change the meetings around over the next week, it is still something that we can do, it is not closed. But I think that it's important now to already book out our meeting room for all the slots. And that evening would be the evening of the AFRALO Showcase from 18h30 to 20h00.

And then come Thursday, we've got our last AFRALO Capacity Building session. Followed by the Capacity Building working group possibly. We'll be inviting Betsy Andrews into that meeting and also launching the online ICANN Learn. And Tijani has been working with Betsy with this as well as myself.

And I looked at the Copenhagen session and I saw that we had two sessions for the ALAC Wrap Up, so the suggestion would be the ALAC Wrap UP 1. And then the AFRALO ICANN Activities Wrap Up over lunch. And there's Part 2 of the ALAC Wrap Up just before the (inaudible)

---

Region. Please, all comments welcome. Over to you Beran, Beran's on the call. Leon, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll make one or two very brief comments. I've seen this before and I couldn't quite follow what you were doing, and so I don't think other people probably can much either. But do look at the document and I presume that's the one attached to the agenda? Or if not, send it out to the ALT if it hasn't already been done, and please, everyone go through it. Again, we often have comments after the fact saying the meeting was not exactly what you people had imagined, but we do need input ahead of time. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. This is Tijani speaking. I would like to say that, yes, 30 minutes extra for Wednesday General Assembly will be very good. Because I guess we will need a lot of time to this General Assembly since we will adopt the review of our Operating Principles. And I think there will be a very large and huge discussion about the proposal of the working group. So, it will be good to put this 30 minutes as an extra time for the General Assembly. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. Cheryl?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl for the record. Just looking at the Wednesday and certainly no criticism or anything on the scheduling at all, this is an opportunity I see. On the Wednesday, just so people don't necessarily think unless you're an active participant in the AFRALO Capacity Building and General Assembly that you can go off and do a tour of the city. The background noise is really annoying, whoever has not got their mic closed. I had a headset on and I'm practically being deafened with whatever's going on.

The fact that the Subsequent Procedure working group on New gTLDs is running that morning in the GNSO I think we should strongly encourage, you may feel, mandate, anybody who's there on ICANN's dime, unless they're otherwise gainfully occupied, to be sitting in the GNSO room and getting themselves up to speed with that. Because we have just discussed our need to renew and resuscitate a very important internal working group and then if we do have the ALAC session after that, it might be an ideal time to see if we can do that kickstarting. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Another point I want to raise here. We will have another activity that is not (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: We seem to have a bad echo from Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, now we don't have echo. I said that there is another activity that AFRALO will undertake in Johannesburg which will be the Local Community Engagement. We are working on two tracks.

The first one is with the University, but we are not lucky because this time will be the end of the year, the University year, and people there on the ground told us that they will check and they will come back to us if we can have something planned, even if there is no more courses or studies on the University, they can plan something and bring the students, bring the teachers, to have this engagement in Johannesburg. We have another possibility also with the ISOC but we will see. We are trying to get two tracks and I hope we will have something very good. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Back to you, Gisella. I'll note that we are running out of time. I don't know if people can stay over a little bit or not. But let's try to keep to it. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you. Are there any other comments on anything on the working groups that we've currently put in, which is the TTF Public Interest, the Outreach and Engagement, the Capacity Building as well, and as we said, the At-Large Review will be during an ALAC working session. Anyone else have anything else to add?

---

As I said, I'm going to get the meeting forms in, if we then need to tweak it, make any changes, it's not the end of the world. But at least we've got our room set up for whenever we want it. However if you see that we need any other meetings or that some meetings can be scheduled against others, as opposed to taking up whole time slots, please do let me know. Then I can use our overflow room as well, bearing in mind that the overflow room doesn't have any interpretation.

HOLLY RAICHE: Gisella, have you got the policy thing that I was going to do?

GISELLA GRUBER: Your big Holly session. Your big Holly session is at the bottom, is a 90 minute during the ALAC working session.

HOLLY RAICHE: I can't see the screen, I'm sorry.

GISELLA GRUBER: Not at all. It will be during the ALAC session, Holly. So, that's not in the individual sessions. So, I've sent it on the ALT Skype chat. I'm just going to put a little note again, if everyone can just have a look at it. I'm going to be submitting the meeting forms tomorrow. If you feel that anything is not in the right place, please do let me know. And I also just need to hear back from the working group Chairs, so if there's any change to that I will let you know on the list as well.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Gisella, it's Cheryl. I'm sorry, I've just stepped away from the computer, Alan. It just struck me as we were going through to have our Public Interest working group opposite the GAC Communique Drafting Session, that might need a shuffle, I don't know. Just GAC may feel that anything to do with public interest, their people should be able to drop in and have a look at. But anyway, just a thought.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay. Is there anyone else who is going to be, for instance, attending the Who Sets ICANN Priorities and the Operational Side meetings? Because Cheryl and Tijani have, well, I've got Tijani for the Operational Side.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will likely do the Priorities one but it's not mandatory, it depends what else we schedule against it.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay. And as it stands now, Alan, before you ask, and not including the GAC session, I'm counting nine and a quarter hours of ALAC working sessions which the Wrap Up.

ALAN GREENBERG: A little bit less than normal but probably reasonable for a four day week.

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay, thank you. I'm just going to send this out again to the ALT. Any suggestions welcome. I'll submit the forms tomorrow and we can always tweak. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. And social events, we are talking about but it is not firm, that we have an ALAC and Regional Leaders Dinner, optional obviously, on Thursday. If people have thoughts on that, get back to Gisella. If there's reasonable interest we'll try to do it. If not, then people are on their own.

Tijani, is that a new hand? No, it is not. Alright. I don't think we know anything more about logistics. The travel page is up, if you haven't filled out your details, please do so. And I have not heard a list of anyone who has not booked travel arrangements. Gisella, do we still have any problems at this point?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, I did get an email through from Constituency Travel. I'll just quickly scan that and get back to you. Also however, if I may mention, that on Tuesday the 16<sup>th</sup> of May, 16h00 UTC, there will be a call for a general update on ICANN 59 by ICANN Meetings team. And if it isn't already on the list, I'll make sure that it's on the list and all the relevant calendars.

And as a reminder, those who are in Johannesburg on Saturday the 24<sup>th</sup> of June, Alan did send a note around to say if anyone was there to have dinner. And I have just got a message through from Banda that on

---

Wednesday the DNS Women's is being organized. I did make her aware of the fact that we're organizing the AFRALO Showcase, and they have sponsorship from Facebook. So, she does not yet have the full details, so we are going to have a conflict there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It will be what it will be. Alright, thank you. We'll go on to the next item and that is the various elections and selections that are going on. Can we pull up the page very quickly? I just want to do a very quick review. And if we can scroll down to the first RALO. Okay, in AFRALO, as you will note, there are people nominated for every position. It looks like we're in moderately good shape. There are no conflicts. So, all of them will end up being acclaimed, I'm assuming. There was one more day until nominations close. APRALO.

It looks like things are under control there. It looks like we'll be welcoming Maureen back again. And there are four people who are currently nominated for the NomCom delegate. It's not clear to me whether APRALO will be selecting one or selecting several, or simply passing all four names on to the ALAC. I understand they are discussing that.

Next. EURALO, we have an interesting situation, in that we don't have a Secretariat nominated. Everyone else there is a single person nominated. Olivier has said there will be a vote to confirm LACRALO, even though there is only one candidate. LACRALO, pretty much everything is, there is a single candidate, presumably they will all be confirmed. Again, presumably with a vote, but I'm not sure. And in



---

NARALO there is a single candidate, with the exception of NomCom where we have two people competing for it and we seem to have added a space in Leah's name.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, this is Heidi. For NARALO there are two candidates for the ALAC member.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Oh, sorry, two candidates for the ALAC position also, thank you for reminding me. Again, for NARALO, I don't know whether they will be voting. I presume they will be voting as is their norm for one of the candidates to be passed on to the ALAC for recommendation as a NomCom member, but maybe not. So, things are largely under control, with the exception of one position that is vacant. EURALO will have to scramble to cover that.

Of course, if there isn't someone named within this period they can also reopen a call for nominations should they choose. I find it a little bit discouraging, although in most cases, the people who are specifically for ALAC are good people, I find it discouraging that it is so hard to get people to put their name in for it. The ITEMS Report notwithstanding, all this marvelous free travel we're getting, you'd think other people would be more interested. But I find it somewhat discouraging that there isn't more competition or aren't more people expressing interest. Any comments on it before we go on to the next item?

---

The next item is an in-camera discussion. I don't know if there's anyone still on the call who is not part of the ALT or advisors. But if we could turn off the recording.

The recording is on. The ALT met in closed session to discuss candidates to replace Wafa who cannot come to the Johannesburg meeting for personal reasons. We have made a selection which the information will be passed on to the ALAC shortly.

Any other business? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing. We are six minutes over. I thank you all for your attention and for a really good meeting. Bye all.

MARIO ALEMAN:

Thank you. The meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. And have a wonderful rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**