

---

GISELLA GRUBER:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly teleconference on Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> of May at 12:00 UTC.

We have quite a large number of attendees today on the call. On the English channel, we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Leon Sanchez, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Otunte Otueneh, Leah Symekher, Yubelkys Montalvo, Satish Babu, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Nadira AlAraj, Wale Bakare, and Vernatius Ezeama,

On the Spanish channel, we have Harold Arcos, Maritza Aguero, and Wladimir Davalos.

On the French channel, we have Sebastian Bachollet and Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong.

Apologies noted today from Javier Rua-Jovet, Kaili Kan, Bastiaan Goslings, Glenn McKnight, Holly Raiche, Seun Ojedeji, Wafa Dahmani, and Andrei Kolesnikov.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yesim Nazlar, Evin Erdogan, Mario Aleman, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

We have French, Spanish, and Russian interpretation on this call. On French, we have Isabelle and Jacques. On Spanish, we have Veronica and David. On Russian, we have Galena and Maya.

---

*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.*

---

I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels, and also to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

Thank you very much, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Gisella. A little bit disappointing that we don't have quorum, but we don't have any formal decisions scheduled for today, although we do have a number of things where I was hoping to get input from the ALAC.

Are there any comments on the agenda or any other business that people would like to schedule?

Dave, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thank you, Alan. I was hoping if it's possible to have a few minutes just to share some of the work being done on the community onboarding pilot for At-Large. I probably just need several minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will add that under Any Other Business.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I was going to ask whether there had been any movement on the response of the ALAC to the re-jigged or amended charter of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance.

ALAN GREENBERG: There hasn't. That I believe is a good question. Can anyone on staff remind me? Olivier, I know we discussed it at a previous meeting. I'm having a blank right now on whether it is something that we discussed at an ALT meeting or an ALAC meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. It was at the last ALAC meeting. There were a few minutes allocated, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: And then we didn't do anything about it ?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Was there an action item?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I don't think so. No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let us raise it during Any Other Business this time and make sure that we have something coming out of it.

Anyone else?

If not, then we will take the agenda as accepted with the two items of Any Other Business and proceed to the first item, which is: review of action items. I am told there is nothing that needs the attention of the ALAC.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan ?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I see that Sébastien has his hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. Hadn't gone up by the time I started talking. Sébastien, go ahead.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. This is the first time I am on the French channel. I would like to tell my colleagues if you only say one sentence, you have to tell your name. Always introduce yourself. Always say your name because there's, of course, one person speaking when an interpreter is speaking with the same voice. We need to know who is speaking, so please introduce yourself every time, or else we cannot know what's going on.

Thank you in advance for always introducing yourself. I know it's no fun, but always give your first name. Even if you only say yes, you have to say, " Sébastien. Yes." Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Sébastien. I'd like to have back from the staff whether the interpreters do recognize my voice and can put the right name on it or if you want me to say Alan every time I speak. I'll wait for a message back on that. But at this point, we'll proceed with the agenda.

The first substantive item is the policy development activities with Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. In the past month, the ALAC was very productive, producing comments to submit to public comment. On the agenda, you can see that we recently submitted six comments. That's a lot of work going on. Thanks to everyone who contributed it. Our work is [due] to ones that are in progress. The first one is Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team draft report of recommendations for new gTLDs. Thanks to Holly drafted very substantive comment and is

---

already submitted for ratification pending... Oh, I was just informed that my audio is not very good. Is this better now? [inaudible] get a feedback. I'm moving near the window. Maybe that will help.

Is this audio better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, I don't know who told you that the audio is not good. I've had no problem hearing you since you started.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, this is Gisella. Sorry, if I may.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. Just to say that sometimes the audio does sound good on the Adobe Connect and on the phone, but for the interpreters, just the way they are connected to the lines, they will say that the audio is not good for them, so they're not able to interpret. But, Ariel, I believe it's okay. Please do proceed. Thank you.

---

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you, Gisella. For the CCT Review draft report, just a quick reminder for the people who haven't voted in the ratification [inaudible], please do that before the 24<sup>th</sup> of May.

The next one is on the GNSO community comment to new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process. As many of you know, we have multiple people from the community developing responses to all four work tracks. Maureen is the main shepherd for this process. She also provided a summary based on the responses others developed to each question.

For the current status, all work tracks except for Work Track 2 have responses posted on the wiki. I will put the link in the chat momentarily. Work Track 2 still is on the development. I know Holly recently submitted some of the responses, so perhaps Holly and Maureen want to talk about the progress here.

I checked with the GSNO staff. They're not going to extend the public comment period. In fact, the end was yesterday. But they are not very strict with the deadline. If we submit a few days later, it's fine.

I will turn over the floor to Maureen or Holly or others to talk about this public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Ariel. Before we go to Maureen or Holly, we really need to figure out some way of getting people to look at these comments and at least put a very short, curt response in, saying, "Yes, I agree with it." Otherwise, it's unclear at the time we come to vote whether only one

person – the person who wrote the original comment – is the only one who's ever looked at them or supports them. So I don't know we have to do this, but we need to get more involvement while these comments are being drafted if we want our credibility to be such that people believe these are in fact statements from the group and not just from a single person.

I'll turn it over to whoever would like to speak. Holly is not on the call, actually, so it's Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. Yes, we applied for a short extension if it was at all possible because it's been rather difficult getting the input, but I've been very appreciate of those who have actually contributed to it. The fact that we've got these four different tracks done – as Ariel said – the information is up there. We would really like you to use the next couple of days, if possible, to have a look at and read through the comments.

There's been a summary done for each, as short as possible. We tried to include a very brief overview of what is being said for each of the questions. We will be sending the responses as well.

Moving from that one to the other one that I've got, which is the .net registry agreement, if you don't mind if I go into that one, that's a work in progress. There's a continuing discussion going on on that one. I'd really like to have a volunteer to make a one-sentence or a little, short paragraph summary of that one because it's quiet a comprehensive and varied discussion that I'm a little bit lost in. So I need some help with that one.

---



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Maureen. Are there any other comments, first of all, on the gTLD one, before we go on to the .net that was Maureen was just talking about?

Cheryl, go right ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. If I may – here I’m slipping on my leadership team hat from this particular PDP Working Group – we really need to make sure that a day or two is all it is in terms of extension. The request for extension filtered through from staff – Ariel, maybe [you got] more flexible on the leadership team wants to be on this. To say it’s still on [inaudible] I think would be complimentary, and statements like “Even the GAC is able to get it in on time this time, so why can’t the ALAC [bandy] it around?” – if it sneaks in in a day or two, that’s fine, but if this lingers on ad nauseum, as others have, Alan, as you will know, it’s not looking good in terms of reputation. So just a cautionary warning here. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just wanted to say one thing. Yes, we will definitely try to get it through tomorrow, I’m sure. It’s just that I’m asking people to read it before they vote. I think we’ve got enough information. Ariel, do you

---

think they got enough information to put it all together and then [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Maureen. I will point out that the ALAC was very vocal during the last gTLD process. If we plan to be this time, then we really need to participate during the process of developing the policy, and not only after the fact when we're not happy with the results. So I do want more than people just reading it. I think we need comments. We need active approval from people before we get to the voting stage. Or we have very little evidence that in fact this is the opinion of the community itself. I'll leave it at that.

On the .net agreement, the discussion for the last while has been almost exclusively between me and Seun. Seun, who is unfortunately not on this call right now, has made a statement on the value of the .net domains and specifically the price they are allowed to charge. He has now brought into it the amount that they bring into ICANN. I'll note that this domain is different than any other in that we levy a significant surcharge per domain. This statement has been made by Seun that he thinks that we really need to make a comment. I haven't heard that same statement from anyone else at this point – at least I don't believe so – and we really need to make a decision on this.

If you go through all the comments, you'll see it. It's not, in my mind, a no-brainer, in that other domains are currently charging more than Verisign does for .net, even though the increases have been substantive. I'll note that the current pricing terms are not something

---

that's been changed in this agreement. They were something that was carried over from before.

Sébastien, go ahead.

Can we get confirmation from the interpreter that Sébastien is talking?

INTERPRETER: I apologize. I didn't hear you give him the floor. He's talking now.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't remember exactly where we are, but as far as the gTLD Working Group, the new and previous gTLD Working Group, I don't know exactly what the status is. The challenge that we have is to keep writing comments and having to read so many pages. All of that is mostly in English. So it would be good to have a place where we can debate, a place where we can discuss and exchange information. So that's my question: what is the status of the gTLD Working Group? Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. That's an item later on on the agenda. Any further comments on this particular policy question? We had finished the gTLD one, although we just went back to it. Now we're on .net. The question is: do we actually need a statement on .net? The consensus of those who volunteered was that we do not.

---

I raised the issue not to add it but simply to point out that it is something that had been raised by others on the pricing. At this point, we need a decision as to whether we go ahead with it or not. At this point, I've only seen one person who feels moderately strongly that we do need to go ahead and make a comment on the pricing.

Does anyone else have any input, or would you like this to be a decision of the Chair and the drafters?

Olivier, go right ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. When it comes down to the pricing, this is a difficult one to work on. I would be a bit concerned if the ALAC starts going to the depth of pricing structures when one thinks of the more than a thousand TLDs out there; the question being if one was to look at the pricing for this, we would then have to engage in looking at the pricing for every single TLD. I'm not sure whether it's in the ALAC's remit to start dealing with pricing on a wide scale for each and every top-level domain.

I understand that each registry has the freedom to choose what type of business model they want to run their domain on and whether they want to have high prices or low prices or increased prices. There are some limits to them being able to change their prices, but I don't know. I'm a little baffled about the depth to the pricing here.

So I would say perhaps not to move and work on this with the limits pricing-wise.

---

On the other hand, I have a concern that I did ask with regards to whether the Registry Agreement is to be automatically renewed or whether this needs to go via bidding process. I'm not quite sure. I see some agreeing with me in the discussion. I'm not quite sure what the end point was with regards to that. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. I can address both of those pretty easily. In terms of the renewal of the contract, ICANN has no choice but to negotiate in good faith with Verisign on that contract. It is a renewable contact subject to agreeing on the terms. There is no question of going out for bid on it unless regulatory authorities, antitrust authorities, in the U.S. said otherwise, and they have not taken that action at this point. So the question of renewal is not a question that is up for grabs at this point.

In terms of the pricing, we are not looking at the pricing of most TLDs. Pricing is outside of the remit of ICANN on virtually all the TLDs with the exception of the three legacy TLDs – .com, .net, and .org. In the case of .com, there is an absolute price cap on it. Verisign is not allowed to increase the price. Then that price is pretty low compared to almost every other TLD. I did raise the issue that, by keeping that price low, we are in fact creating perhaps unnatural competition for the new TLDs. But that's not a question that is up for grabs at the moment.

.org and .net have price increase limitations built into their contract. In the case of .net, it is a limitation of no more than a 10% increase to registrars every year. That is the point that we're debating.

---

So there's no question. We're not looking at the pricing of all TLDs. This is very unique to the legacy TLDs.

I'll turn it over to Harold next.

HAROLD ARCOS: This is Harold speaking. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you again. Alan. With respect to pricing, I agree with Olivier. However, I want to place the following on the table. We should also be more concerned about the issue of accessibility in the sense that cost should not be impossible to afford. And it shouldn't be difficult for users because gTLDs actually are an opportunity in countries like ours so we that we can actually have a tool for social development and to start an important space for different kinds of movements. As the market survey stated, in Latin America, there are very hard challenges in this regard. As ALAC, perhaps we should raise the importance that, even though we're not going to fix pricing, it may be easy for us to [say] as sort of a [inaudible] for broadband that should not exceed \$5 for the cost of access to the Internet. So these are the kinds of measures that we can study.

---

We can also reflect in our recommendations the importance that pricing should not be hard to afford for our users. This I think is an important opportunity for us to access this market. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. As I pointed out, we do have .com, which is set at a very low price and cannot increase until 2024 or something like that.

Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. Just two quick things. First, when it comes down to pricing, I find it quite amusing that we look at the \$5, \$7, \$8 price range and so on when we all know absolutely so well that, when it comes down to .net and .com, there are no empty names these days. There are no unregistered names. They're all sold at a premium for hundreds of dollars, if not thousands or tens of thousands, when it comes down to having a good name in .com and .net. So it's quite amusing to see that.

If you want to have a cheap name, a name that's not going to cost you an arm and a leg, then maybe you can look into other alternatives. I know that some .whateveritis does \$1 a year and I'm sure provides enough accessibility to people.

But I do have some concerns on one point that you have said, Alan, and that's down to the antitrust and competition and having an undue influence on the market. .net and .com are just two gTLDs out there. If one looks at that single company that has now also got .web, I

---

understand, I don't think it's down to the ALAC to call then competition authorities. But I'm just surprised that our members do not call on their government because ultimately it is their government that would be looking into this and pointing out that it seems that there is one player that basically controls the market. Very strange indeed. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Strange but nothing we have control over at this point. I will point that most registrars, at least the large registrars, are regularly offering domains at 99 cents for the first year or the first two years. So lots of deals are available if you're looking to get into the market.

Harold, is that a new hand? I'll assume it is not a new hand.

Ariel, back to you. We need to complete this relatively quickly. We're starting to run out of time.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. Just to clarify, have we made a decision yet on this public comment?

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have not made a decision, but unless I hear strong arguments for actually commenting on the substance of what is in the contract – that is, should there be a 10% maximum increase allowed or not – then I am assuming that, between the drafters and the Chair, we will make a decision unless someone else speaks up.



ARIEL LIANG:

Okay. Thanks, Alan. The next one in progress is recommendations to improve SO/AC accountability. Alan drafted a statement and just posted it on the wiki. We'll quickly open that for public comment until the end of this week because public comment's closing day is this Friday. So we probably will give people a few days to read through this while we submit and then ratify it after the fact.

Alan, do you want to add anything?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I do. I did draft a comment, which is largely based on the comments that I made in the wiki over a week ago, I think. I did make one additional change. The SSAC has come out with their comment, and they said something that I thought was particularly relevant and incorporated it, that is the recommendations had suggested that the ATRT be explicitly charged with reviewing each AC/SO and deciding whether they have in fact implemented the best practices or not.

I suggested that that not be something added to the ATRTs. The ATRTs are going to be burdened heavily enough as it is. Any ATRT can decide to do that if it chooses because the ATRT has now been given an open-ended mandate to review whatever they think is necessary but that we add it on to the things that they feel they might be obliged to do and that the regular cyclical reviews on organization are sufficient to address that. So I did at that one comment.

---

If anyone else has any comments, please put them on the wiki. We need to finalize that one quickly.

Next, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. The next is a revised ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts with [property] law process and next steps. I know EURALO ALSes are in collaboration developing a statement, and I see Olivier raise his hand so I'll let him speak.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. There was some draft comments that were suggested by Christopher Wilkinson, and Olivier posted them to the wiki. I asked a number of questions on that. I personally find that the comment as currently drafted says we have to do something but it's not, from my point of view, clear what Christopher is suggesting. I think we need some more clarity on that.

We have several hands up. The first is – I think Harold's is still an old one, at which point I'll go to Olivier. If Harold's is new, please let us know through the interpreter.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. I just wanted to mention two things. The first is a thank you for the response that you made to Christopher.

---

Because I put myself the comment onto that wiki page, I'll let Christopher know of your response and point him this so he can engage in the discussion with you on this.

On a wider issue, we are using this statement – the one on handling WHOIS conflict – and the next one, the draft framework of interpretation for human rights, for a pilot, if you want, a test, of our ALSes. As you know, we have compiled a list of At-Large Structure expertise that we put together in a table. We have therefore targeted these two statements by contacting directly the ALSes that have previously showed an interest or have declared themselves as being experts in that topic. We did send them this yesterday, so it will take a little while for them to come back to us.

But a handful of ALSes have already come back to us and said, "Oh, that's for notifying us personally. We're going to look at this." So I can't really give you any answer yet, but hopefully within the next week, we'll have a better idea of how many European At-Large Structures are doing to take part of this and see if this process of directly notifying ALSes with expertise of those public comments, encouraging their input in there, works or not. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. That raises an interesting issue: if you're successful, you'll get good involvement from the European ALSes. We do have to be careful, however, since the privacy issue is one that is of particular interest in Europe and there are specific laws that are going to place in Europe. We do have to make sure that our statements are not focusing

---

purely on the European point of view and can reflect the rest of the worldwide community that we're speaking on behalf of. So although that is a good sign – that you're getting involvement from those ALSes – we have to make sure that we're not ending up with a skewed comment because of that specific interest and the legal environment that they are working under.

Sébastien, go right ahead.

Can we have confirmation that Sébastien is speaking?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. Two things. Sorry, I'm a little bit late. Talking about SO/AC accountability, let's not forget two points that were raised in the last ATLAS Summit and at ALAC as well. It's to have a place where we have a systemic review of the entire organization. It's very important today. The ATRT takes that into account.

Second point. Maybe it's because I was listening in French, but I was surprised – Alan, you talked about the European position. I'm looking at what Olivier's writing in the chat. I think it's important that the four other regions do bring their contributions, but if the Europeans are more interested in the topic, well, it's too bad for the rest of the world. We cannot have a very involved ALS and then tell them, "You're Europeans. You talk a lot about this subject. We want worldwide representation." So I want to make sure that I understood clearly, Alan, what you said about that. We have to welcome with interest the very participating ALSes. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To be clear, if we have a statement drafted only by one part of the community and everyone else votes for it, then it is a statement of the ALAC. I want to make sure that, if indeed there are differences, they are reflected in the statement. We do not want statements that are adopted without consideration of the other regions, nor do we want statements that are drafted laboriously and then rejected by the ALAC because they don't represent other regions. So I think we need involvement at all levels. Thank you.

Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. There's one more public comment that just opened, which is on the proposed implementation on GNSO consensus policy recommendations for the protection of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLDs. That will close after ICANN 59, so July the 10<sup>th</sup>. We have a bit of time for which to work on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I have a personal opinion on that one. That is the PDP that closed in 2014. We are now looking at implementing it. It was of little consequence. It was of great emotion but little real consequence. It had to do with protection of Red Cross names and international Olympic committee names. Although the concept is important on Red Cross, it is not going to have any real effect. It is all essentially emotional because, if people are doing phishing or creating

---

false websites, they don't use the exact name anyway. They use a version of it. I don't think that we need to make any comment on this. It is an issue that should have died or been finished long ago. The fact that we're still working on it, I don't think it has any real consequence for users. But other people may have different opinions.

If anyone has a strong opinion that we should make a comment on it and wants to start working on it, I will expect them to make themselves known quickly. Other than that, I'm happy if we do not comment on this one.

Anyone have any comments before we go on? Ariel said that that's the last one, so we'll go onto the next agenda item unless there's anyone who puts up their hand quickly. Or calls out.

Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we'll go onto the next item, which is the review of ALS applications. Evin, can you please go ahead?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Hello, everyone. I'll be brief. We have 224 ALSes in 100 countries. We [inaudible] certified [inaudible] ISOC from AFRALO. And Internet development initiatives from APRALO. We're awaiting regional advice for the Armenian Internet Traffic Exchange Foundation, or Armix, from AFRALO, as well as the Cyber Cafe Association from AFRALO. We're currently assessing due diligence for [inaudible] Software in AFRALO and the Internet Society Capitulo Paraguay in LACRALO. Thanks. That's all from me.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Any comments?

Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we'll go onto the next item, which is reports. We normally don't go into depth on the reports from liaisons, RALOs, or working groups, but if anyone has anything they want to highlight, then this is the opportunity.

Is there anyone who wishes to raise anything at this point? Maureen says nothing from her. Dev, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thank you. Just a point for outreach and engagement. We've created a draft [for] outreach strategic plans for FY18. I'll post the link the chat. This is for RALOs to help begin planning the RALO outreach strategies for the upcoming CROP. This is formally the CROPP program but outreach is no longer a part of it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Excuse me, Dev. Do we have the music under control from staff? I'm assuming we do.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Apologies for the interruption. Yes [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Sorry, Dev. Back over to you.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: So we created this wiki page to help RALOs begin planning the RALO outreach strategies for the upcoming CROP, which was formally CROPP but now losing the pilot status. The outreach plans need to be approved by the regional GSEs, Global Stakeholder Engagement, in order for the trip proposals to be submitted for approval by At-Large and the Global Stakeholder Engagement teams at least seven weeks before such travel takes place.

The reason why we're doing this now is because, if there are any proposals that need to happen in mid-July 2017 or in August 2017, the outreach plans need to be approved, I would say, by early June or mid-June 2017. I've already sent out an e-mail, but I just thought I'd repeat it here. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Dev. Any other comments? It is pleasing to see the strategies being done now instead of several months into the fiscal year.

Judith has a comment, saying it's not called CROPP without the extra P. I believe it is still called CROP. At least that it is how it was referred to in the financial reports.

Hearing no other comments and seeing no other volunteers for comments on their reports, I will go onto the first item, and that is the At-Large Review. I'll turn it over to Holly or Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's me, Alan. Cheryl.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. That's right. Holly is not on the call. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Not a great deal of substantive updates for you all on the ALAC review, other than to reiterate where we are up to, as we did in our last meeting. The review is at that point where we as a review team within the At-Large Advisory Committee are to work on accepting/rejecting/modifying/showing to what degree things are implementable or otherwise. So we're at the beginning of the next stage of our process.

With the very pretty slide that someone has put up on the screen – and I've just got booted out of the Adobe Connect room, so I apologize for that. So I can't actually speak to a slide that I've never seen before. What we are doing at this stage on the 24<sup>th</sup> at 21:00 UTC, the [Missy] team/staff team – we have a new staff member whose name is currently escaping me – Heidi will put it into the chat, I'm sure – who's going to take over from Lars as primary point person as we move into this next phase. We'll be meeting with the team, looking at some [inaudible] opportunities for us to start doing this next phase of work and start getting things together for us to take things towards this delivery of the next phase to the Structural Improvements Committee – in fact, it's no longer called Structural Improvements. It's the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, I thought.

I'm back in the Adobe room. We're pleased to report, however, that I think everybody who was previously in the At-Large Review working

---

party has considered their willingness to continue on for the next phase of our work. We will be hoping that we have a bit of interaction in front of the agenda time at the Johannesburg meeting as well.

I think that's it in terms of [inaudible], Heidi can help me with the name of the new person. Nicky? [inaudible]? [Nika]? Am I saying that correct ?

ALAN GREENBERG: Negar Farzinnia.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Negar Farzinnia. She will be helping all reviews with their implementation. So she'll be a bit of a liaison between the next stage with At-Large and staff. I look forward to working with her.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's terrific. What that means is that, after our introductory getting-to-know-you meeting with her on the 24<sup>th</sup>, knowing that Maritza is still in overall management control, we should be producing a timeline and arranging meetings, etc., for the substantive work for the next phase to begin.

That's it from me, unless there's any other questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Cheryl. That slide deck did talk about something that happened by a different committee that no longer exists since

---

January 2015. I'm not quite sure what the relevance of that deck is, but I'm sure we'll find out in due time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No idea.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is sort of nice if the people presenting know about the visual effects, but I guess we always like surprises.

Any further comments? I will note that, in the agenda, there is a document link that I put together of purely personal views of where I think we may want to be going in responding to these recommendations. If anyone cares to look at it and provide me with any feedback on whether you're agreeing or disagreeing with what I said, that would be interesting from my perspective. That's not the working party's response. That is just something I put together just to get my thoughts in order.

Next item on the agenda is the ALAC teleconferences, and that's this conference. I would like to take a few minutes – obviously, we can follow on later on this – and talk about how useful these meetings are to people and how we can make them more effective and productive. Given the attendance today, I can also say how can we make them better attended?

When I look at other ACs and SOs and the attendance they get on their monthly meetings, certainly from my perspective we are not doing as well as some of them. I guess I'm curious as to why. We set these

---

agendas based on the issues that seem relevant at the moment, and I'd like some feedback from people as to how effective are these calls. Are we getting fewer people on the calls because they're not effective and they're boring? How can we make them more effective and productive?

I'll open the floor for a few minutes, but this will be an ongoing discussion for a while, not necessarily focused on this meeting. If anyone has any thoughts right now, I welcome them.

If there are no thoughts, then we will save the time. But I see Tijani does have his hand up. Go ahead, Tijani.

We cannot hear you, Tijani.

Tijani's microphone is marked as muted. I don't know whether that is relevant or not. It is now unmuted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you hear me ?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can hear you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Oh, good. Okay. Good. Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, you're right to raise this [inaudible]. First of all, there is a problem of timing. This can be solved by a small – we have a record of all the meetings we have, and we know what are the times when we had the maximum amount of people. This can be solved in this way.

But there is another problem because some people – I will not say never show up; it's not true – but some people don't come to the ALAC meetings. I think that ALAC members are coming not always – not everyone – but they are coming. My concern, and I think yours also, is about the other community members, the other regional members, who don't attend those calls. This is related to the [inaudible] the regions to the ALAC work. This is a very big problem. We discussed it before, but we never found the deep reasons for why the interest – I remember when I started my journey people who were speaking about language, about a huge report, etc., etc. The more we progress, the more I am convinced that it is not exactly this. There's something else.

So how do we interest our people? This is a big problem and the big question. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. I will note we have more non-ALAC members and even non-regional leaders on these calls these days than we ever have had before. It's still not a huge number, but there are more.

---

In terms of people who don't come to these meetings, we are now tracking and posting records of ALAC members and regional leaders who are attending these meetings or not. We started several months ago with hosting last year's numbers, and I believe we now have charts for this year's. I have heard no comments back from anyone on those, but I suggest that people take a look at them. Maybe staff can put some wiki pointers into the agenda so people can be reminded of them.

Any other comments other than Tijani's?

I notice Rinalia has joined us in the meeting. Welcome, Rinalia.

No other comments? Then we'll go onto the next agenda item. But this is an issue of some import. The agendas are largely determined by Heidi and I, factoring in anyone's request for putting things on the agenda. But to be honest, we rarely get anything, so at this point, these meetings are largely focused on what we believe is important, based on the current subjects of the day.

All right. We seem to have At-Large Review on the agenda twice. I'm not quite sure why it is number seven and ten. I didn't notice when we did the agenda, nor did Heidi. So we've now saved another five minutes.

At-Large at ICANN59. I'll turn it over to Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. I will bring up the document which was shared with the internal ALAC list yesterday, which is the ICANN main schedule as it stands today, if you just bear with me. I'm bringing up the document. For those who received it via the e-mail last night – sorry. I do apologize.

---

I'm having a problem with the document. It's not uploading. Just bear with me. I do apologize for the slight technical issue.

There. It's on its way into the Adobe Connect.

It's not coming up at all. I do apologize for this technical issue. It's not coming up.

I'm just going to have to talk you through it as we try to get the document up. For those who have it, if you would be so kind to bring it up on your screen. I have no idea why my computer's not [inaudible] –

ALAN GREENBERG:

Gisella, while you're trying to get the document up, I'll tell you the current events. Yesterday we found out that the outreach event that AFRALO had been planning with a local university, which had been scheduled for Thursday afternoon, was not going to work because apparently the students would already be on their winter break and therefore would not be there. We have no tentatively – but we're still waiting on confirmation from Tijani – moved it to Monday morning. That is going to be in conflict with ALAC and regional leaders sessions.

Therefore, instead of having people dedicated to go into the meeting and spending the two or three hours with the students, we will have people potentially dashing in and out. We will do our best to schedule things in those two to three hours of ALAC sessions that will not conflict too much with the people who need to be in the regional outreach session.

---

It also means we will not be able to have interpretation for that session, which means that, although we had planned to have all of the AFRALO ALSes representatives attend the session, since we will not have French interpretation, we will not be able to do that. This has come up at the very last moment, and it doesn't look like we have a lot of choice. But we're trying to make due as best we can.

Back over to you, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you very much, Alan. Thank you very much, [inaudible], for assisting with the technical glitch.

What you see up on the Adobe Connect is the ICANN59 draft schedule, which has not yet been finalized, as it stands today. I'm going to take you down to the start of the official ICANN59, which is on Monday, the 26<sup>th</sup> of June. On Sunday the 25<sup>th</sup> is the CCWG meeting – I'll just show you – as well as the CCT and the Security, Stability, and Resilience Review Team.

Taking you back to Monday, I'm now going to unsync so that you can all move forward at your own pace. The ALAC will be meeting mainly in Ballroom 4, as well as Boardrooms 3 and Committee on Tuesday, when we have the AFRALO ALS capacity-building session in the morning, as well as the ICANN Academy Working Group, running from 8:00 to 9:00. On Wednesday, we have the capacity-building session running parallel with the At-Large Technology Task Force. There's apparently the two overlapping meetings that we do have.



---

As I said, I did send it around to the ALAC internal list last night. I haven't had any comments so far, except for Holly acknowledging. If I may just quickly run through the social events that are currently planned, which are on Monday night – sorry, one step back. The format of the policy forum in Helsinki was that each evening we had a networking cocktail from 6:30 to 7:30 in the evening, which allowed everyone to get together, usually in the foyer area. In Johannesburg, it will be the same format, except that on Monday evening we will have an evening hosted by the South African host. The location hasn't yet been confirmed, but it is likely to be off-site and opened to everyone registered without a limited number of attendees.

On Tuesday, from 6:30 to 8:00, we have the Fellowship Program's 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration. On Wednesday evening, we have the At-Large AFRALO Showcase, running from 6:30 to 8:00 in the evening. Parallel to that, we will have the networking cocktail. The idea behind that is that the AFRALO Showcase will be held from 6:30 to 7:00 in the ALAC room with interpretation and that we will join into the main cocktail. Entertainment will be provided for everyone.

On Thursday evening, we have the ICANN community wrap-up cocktail from 6:30 to 8:00.

I see that there are some questions in the Adobe Connect. I haven't read through them yet. So those are my comments on the schedule. Alan, would you like to add anything? Or Heidi?

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think so. The comments in the chat are more related to whether the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee is involved in the local outreach issues. I'd like to think that people are getting things involved. If not, then we have a problem that we need to fix in the background. But I have no other comments on other issues.

This is looking up to be a meeting that's going to be as difficult to schedule as the previous ones. We at this point are now looking at about nine hours of At-Large, regional, and regional leaders' time together instead of the norm of twelve. As just noted, about two of those hours are going to be in conflict with an outreach and engagement session. So it doesn't look really great for how we're moving forward.

But it is what it is. Sébastien, go right ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. I do have a question. If I understand correctly, every evening between 3:00 and 5:00 P.M. there is a session where everyone gathers. Do I understand this correctly? Or what exactly is that about? [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Gisella? I think Sébastien is talking about the cross-community sessions that, to a large extent, are not going to be opposed by other sessions. We are allowed to schedule against them, but in most of the cases, we decided that these are relevant issues for At-Large and we have chosen not to schedule against it. That is something that went out to the ALAC

---

about two weeks ago to question whether the ones we selected are indeed the right ones or not. Other than that, I think that answers Sébastien question, but I'm not 100% sure.

I'll go to Cheryl, who has her hand up, and then we'll go back to Gisella.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Forgive me for not having put my hand up earlier, but I'm in another ICANN call at the same time, so I've got another speaker in one ear. I'm a little distracted with the other agenda.

I just wanted to check with Gisella on something that occurred to me as I was doing a brief review of this agenda – thanks very much for sending it – and that had to do with the GNSO scheduling as listed on this agenda. My reason for wondering about it is that, the last time we looked at as a more [blocked] agenda, it appeared that...

There's a background noise. I don't think it's my line that's responsible for it.

So it appears that at least I think it was going to be the Wednesday morning when the GNSO was apparently going to be having their substantive – what is that noise ? – conversation on the new gTLD PDP Working Group [inaudible] –

GISELLA GRUBER: Cheryl, if I may [inaudible]

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You may.

GISELLA GRUBER: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I honestly can't even hear you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Both Cheryl and Gisella are –

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we know where that sound is coming from?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, this is Gisella. It is [inaudible] the Adobe Connect. I'm trying to mute him, and every time I mute him, he unmutes. I'm just scared to try to get him out of the AC room. [inaudible]

Alan, sincere apologies. I have dropped Isaac Maposa from the call.  
[inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. You have dropped who?

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Isaac Maposa.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. Sorry, it was muffled. I couldn't hear. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. If i may come back to my question, which Gisella probably [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The earlier block schedule looked as if the GNSO discussion on new gTLDs, which clearly most of our committee and community would have keen interest in, was going to be at a time where there was little if any clashing. I was looking to see that that was still the case, and I can't even find that listed as a GNSO topic. I'm also not able to find a recent GNSO schedule. So I just wanted to make sure we check on the accuracy of what's listed here from the GNSO because, obviously, there are a couple of things. For example, the New gTLD Program subsequent procedure that we do still need to try to minimize our clashes for. I thought it was Wednesday morning when there was very little that was going to be clashing. But if we're shuffling outreach activities, I'm not sure what's going on now.

---

And my reason for being keen on this – if I may, just in closing, Alan, because this is probably something Gisella has to double check with the GNSO staff – for asking if at the meeting of the GNSO Council, Donna Austin, Vice Chair of the GNSO Council specifically asked both myself and the ccNSO liaison whether we believed we would be able to bring our people, our community into the GNSO room for some of these conversations to be more engaged, which they felt was desirable. So, I just wanted to, A, ask where the hell that may have gone to, and B, remind everybody that if you're not otherwise occupied, to be in policy discussions in the GNSO would be very much a good thing and an excellent PR exercise. Thank you. I'll try to get my left eardrum back functional now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. I think you, Gisella and I are going to have to speak online on this. There's certainly the gTLD PDP which is opposed and some of us will be attending. That notwithstanding, there's a cross-community session on country codes which we are not opposing. I was not aware of a general discussion of the gTLD PDP other than the PDP meeting.

I presume there will be a brief review for the GNSO at some point, but I was not aware that that was anything that we were invited to or trying to schedule around. So, I'm a little bit taken by surprise by that statement, and I think we're going to need to look at that offline.

I think the chances of us being able to cordon off what are essentially random sessions of the GNSO internal sessions that are not listed as

---

public sessions is going to be almost impossible, unless we choose not to meet as a group at all in Johannesburg. Gisella, go ahead, and then Sébastien.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. Just to clarify, this again reflects all the meeting forms that have been submitted. Now, on Wednesday... I've actually unsynced people can't scroll. On Wednesday from 8:30 to 12:00, the GNSO new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. Against that, we only have AFRALO activities, purposely done so, capacity building, AFRALO General Assembly part 1 and part 2.

Now, if at any point in the GNSO schedule a PDP is being discussed as an internal GNSO working session, it may not be put in the meeting form, hence it won't come up on this schedule. We are keeping a close eye on the GNSO schedule. There have been several changes, but at the time that we did actually do – that's at least submitted the meet – sorry, at the time that we put together At-Large [draft] schedule, we took into account the latest version of the GNSO schedule that we had. Does that help?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Gisella. And I think that confirms what I said, that we're not aware of what's going on in the actual internal discussions of the GNSO, and this is the first I've heard that there's something we should be trying to block out.

---

Sébastien, you had your hand up and lowered it. Do you still want to speak, or not? I guess not. So, Cheryl, if you can get any more information and feed it to Gisella, we can try to figure out what's going on here. I'm really a bit at a loss.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Shall do,] Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just saying shall do, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. Fine. Any further comments? Then back to Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: I don't have any further comments at this stage. However, I would like to hand it over to Heidi to see if she has any further comments. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. And I will note that we're starting to run short of time. But Heidi, go ahead.



---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I don't, Gisella. You've done fantastic. I do not have any further comments. I'm waiting for this all to be completed, and then we'll start on the agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Heidi. I think we're done with that item. We'll go back to item number nine which I did miss. When I noticed that there were two copies of the At-Large review, I unfortunately skipped over item number nine on restarting the gTLD and registration issues working groups. Can we bring up the graphed mission statement? And I'll talk about it for a little bit.

These are groups that we have tried to restart several times now over many months. We have not succeeded. On the gTLD, we tried appointing co-Chairs and that was done, but before we could call for attendance for members and start the meetings, one of the co-Chairs resigned and the other one said it's really going to be difficult to carry this on.

So, the concept of finding Chairs and then soliciting members does not seem to be working properly. What I decided might be worthwhile – and I'm bringing it to this group for discussion – is I very quickly – and I didn't spend a lot of time on it – drafted a mission statement. I think we've generally agreed that our groups do not necessarily have 12-page charters, but they must have a mission statement.

And what I thought might be useful is to draft a mission statement and use that as a solicitation tool to get membership, and then once we get

---

members – assuming we have people who are interested in the issue, and I hope we will – they can then select a Chair and start working.

Now, these missions are not meant to be the end-all of the mission. Clearly, the group would have the opportunity to revise the mission if necessary and ask for ALAC approval, but I thought that by putting some words down and sending it out widely, we might get some people who will start getting involved.

As Sébastien pointed out earlier – and I pointed out a number of times – we are in bad shape that we have moderately small membership in the working groups that are doing the actual work on gTLDs, on RDS WHOIS and a number of other issues, and we really need a forum within At-Large to more widely discuss these issues and look at our strategy for how to go forward.

So, these working groups are the forum that we say we use. There has been a lot of comment on working groups in the At-Large review where the external reviewers have suggested that we just abandon these working groups, and we said, “No, no, they’re important.”

But important working groups that we can never actually get to meet are somewhat questionable. So, I’m suggesting that we go forward with these missions, or if anyone would like to take a hand at suggesting changes, that we do it moderately quickly and that we solicit membership to reform both of these groups.

I see Sébastien has his hand up, and please go ahead.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Thank you, Alan, for giving me the floor. I would say well done, this is a good proposal. It's going to be very useful. What I would suggest, when you look for a Chairperson, we cannot ask that person to know everything in extenso about the topic. Let me give you an example. Olivier is a Chair of the working group on the future of ICANN. He does coordination work on what different people learned with other groups, and he doesn't participate in all the working group. He's already very busy.

What we're looking for is not to overwhelm people with work. We have to find the right Chairs who can coordinate the work and can work on one or two issues. The GNSO, and we need a Chairperson who's going to be a coordinator instead of someone who knows everything and is able to talk about everything.

Thank you, Alan, this is a very good document. I think it's going to be very useful to think about those working groups. This is good. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. I will point out that when we did solicit Chairs for these working groups, we only had volunteers on the gTLD one, and in both cases, these were people who had virtually no experience in that area before. They did say that they were willing to get involved and join the working groups, so at least they were aware of what was going on, but we did not put any prior requirement that they be subject matter experts.

---

We did put requirements on saying they were willing to lead the group and chair meetings and things like that. So, I don't think we are being overly demanding, but maybe there is a different perception there. Olivier has asked to please unsync that document is all displayed, but if you unsync, then people can blow it up and make it a little bit larger and perhaps readable.

It is attached to the agenda. I don't really want to have a substantive discussion of the contents, but I would welcome any input in the next week or so from people, and we will then send out a wide call for membership assuming that this is good enough just to form the group. It can be revised. Olivier, go right ahead please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. And I'd like to echo Sébastien's points. Chair for these groups really is there to keep the train running on time. Of course, there needs to be some knowledge of the issue. The Chair does have to scope out what's going on in the different groups that it needs to follow, so when it comes down to the new gTLD process, it would have to look at the consumer trust reviews, it would have to look at the subsequent procedures PDP, but it would only need to look at this from the status page of these working groups, these PDPs, which by the way I'm not sure our community is aware of, but all of that is being updated on the GNSO website. And it's actually pretty good, pretty up to date. You can read reports quite regularly and inform yourself of the helicopter view, as one would say it. The view from the top of what's going on and where the group is.

---

And then it's down to keeping the trains going on time. In other words, to think of ways to get our community involved and schedule regular calls, build the agenda for these calls and be the outlet or enable this as being the outlet for our members who are involved in these working groups, because we have people from our community who are deep inside those working groups. For these people to have an outlet and be able to tell the rest of us what's going on in there, and just help them communicate this.

So, yes, there is some work involved, but if you're just in charge of one working group like this, I don't think it's a huge mountain of work. It just needs a bit of dedication, a few hours a week to be able to keep track. And a little bit of knowledge in the topic, but you can acquire this quite quickly. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. And as I said, we did not require knowledge looking for Chairs. We had very few volunteers, and those we have have largely backed out of it. So, we may hire you to go on a bandwagon tour to try and solicit new volunteers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

And Alan, just one last thing. As I said in the past – and I'll say it again – I'd be absolutely happy to mentor anyone into these positions. I'm not going for these positions because I'm already chairing so many things. I don't have overall so much time, even if it was a few minutes, to devote to this on that. And I think it's also seeing that the At-Large review has made accusations that it's always the same people doing everything. It

---

would be really great that we share the load among more people. I'm not sure [with] the same faces chairing all the groups. So, that's one of the reasons that I'm not stepping forward for that. But as a mentor from the edge, from the back seat, from wherever, I'm ever so happy to help out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. Noted. We did make that offer to the people who volunteered, but we are where we are. Any further items on this? Cheryl, go right ahead. Yes, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Someone else wants to speak first. I'll take the next line.

ALAN GREENBERG: I could not hear what you were saying and someone else was trying to speak also. Cheryl, go right ahead. If there's someone else to speak, we'll do it after Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thank you. I was just going to stand back in the queue because I've already spoken a bit in today's meeting. But I will take the advantage now of being given the floor. I am, as you know, perfectly and absolutely supportive of the supportive internal working groups to act as a source material, input, discussion points, etc. for these much larger and very extensive processes. I think it worked successfully as a model in the transition – I couldn't remember the word then. Then

---

again, I do have someone talking in my other ear – in the transition work, and in the accountability Work Stream 1 and to a lesser extent Work Stream 2.

But I just want a little cautionary point to be here as well, and that is this should not be seen as a replacement for being involved where possible in the actual PDP processes that go on. And as someone like yourself, Alan, is deeply involved in the other PDP processes, I don't want these internal groups – which I do support and I will mentor and assist – to become so onerous in themselves, and as themselves fulfilling [inaudible] gazing exercise, that they take too much of the time away from volunteers who are engaging in the PDP process.

So, let's make sure we also get a good balancing act out of this as well. Yes. I don't need to share my calendar, but if someone wants to know how many hours I put into PDP processes a week, you'll be hard pushed to make me attend too frequent a week meeting from this type of working group internal to the ALAC. So, I just wanted to put that as a warning as well. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. Given that these groups have met zero hours in the last several years, I don't think we're currently in danger of having them overwhelm us. But your point is well taken. Anyone else want to make any comments on this?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

León.

ALAN GREENBERG: León, go right ahead.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. Just to [inaudible] agreement with that Olivier and Cheryl said, and I would also volunteer to mentor anyone who is in need of mentoring.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I hope we'll get some volunteers of people to be mentored now that we have all the mentors. Any further comments on this item before we go on to the next one?

Alright, next item is ICANN59. Do we want to reinstitute meeting reports? Now, if we can go a little bit into the deep, dark history of this, we used to spend significant time at the start of an ICANN meeting deciding who would go to what non-ALAC, non-At-Large session who would be responsible for creating a meeting report.

We tried to make sure that everyone had several responsibilities, and that we therefore had reviews of pretty much all other things of interest to At-Large that other people could look at, since in general most people can only go to one meeting at a time.

We were moderately successful. Some of those reviews were useful, some of them were less so. It was sometimes difficult getting commitments from people to do them. Over the last number of years, that practice has essentially disappeared.



---

We still have a meeting report page on the wiki and there are a few brave souls who contribute reports of specific meetings to it, but they are very few and far between. And the issue was raised by someone in another part of ICANN asking me, do we have meeting report requirements and things like that?

And I thought I'd raise it at this meeting: do we want to formally reinstitute this, and make sure that we are assigning or people volunteer for various meetings, and that they actually create the reports so that people can have a broader idea of what's going on in ICANN other than the meetings they can personally attend?

And I'm opening the floor up. Do we want to do this, do we just drop it and keep it dead, or do we want yet another variation different from what we did before but with a similar intent? And I open the floor. If there's no interest, we won't do it. Sébastien, go right ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you. I am now in the English channel. Sorry for that, and you will hear my voice directly for the English channel people. It's just to say that I think it's much more interesting to get feedback on what's happening in the other meetings during [in itself] and with a Skype chat open and people commenting on what is happening, maybe inputting more emphasis on that to give a more in-depth or more information what is happening in the content. I guess it's enough, at least from my point of view. Thank you very much.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. I guess my point of view is if I'm involved in the meeting, I don't really focus on the chat in terms of what's going on. In other meetings, I may occasionally notice it. So, I'm not sure it has the same lasting value. Tijani, go right ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very good. So, my experience for this kind of activity during the ICANN meeting is that I attend several meetings which are not At-Large. And at the beginning, I made a small report for each one, and then I don't do, for several reasons.

First of all, my activity and my involvement in the ICANN meeting is growing and growing. So, I don't find time to write something and to – every day, I sleep late and I wake up early because I want to prepare the day, etc. So, in my point of view, it is a problem of also time for people who are attending.

Doing a lot of things at the same time, some people are very skilled in it. Not everyone. So, I think that attending the other sessions is very important. I am not sure if anyone is reading the reports. This is also a problem because when I stopped posting the reports, nobody felt and told me, "Why you don't send reports?" I know that the leadership of

---

At-Large say we need the reports, where are the reports, but people who are reading, I don't feel that someone is reading those reports.

So, to be efficient and effective, I am like Alan. I cannot focus on Skyping while I am involved in a meeting. So, it would not be effective for me or efficient. If the report is important for someone, yes, I will force myself and I will make reports. But tell me it first who is reading them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And Cheryl also questioned whoever read the reports. I was not a strong supporter of these reports at the time, because in general I didn't have enough time to write reports if I was actually going to go to the meetings.

On the other hand, I suspect that part of the motivation was to make sure that for some of our people who are not quite as active as others that they actually went to meetings, and the obligation to submit a report was perhaps coercion to force them to actually go to a meeting as opposed to taking the time off.

I'm not sure how relevant that was because we're going back a good number of years at this point. I don't sense a great interest in reinstating this kind of practice at this point. Is that the sense of the room? If I don't hear more, I will presume that there is no great interest and we will not talk about doing anything more formal.

I will still encourage people to go to other meetings and to provide some level of brief summary or at least a report that they were there,

---

that they can personally be consulted if someone is curious about what happened. That I think does have some merit.

Alright. I see no more comments. We will go on to the next item in the agenda. The next item in the agenda is mentoring. We talk a lot about mentoring. We have a few people who do what I think is a superb job as mentors. We have other people – and I class myself among them – who say, “I’m going to mentor new people as they come into the ALAC and regional leaders,” and I’m not sure I follow through on that very well.

We will likely have a number of new people in positions – well, we know we will have some new people because we have regional leaders who have been appointed who are new to the leadership positions, and we will likely have a couple of new ALAC members coming in. Well, we know we will have at least two.

And the question is, do we want to formalize the process a little bit? And I was thinking of something to the effect of a focus webinar, and not one necessarily open to everyone, but open to people who identify themselves as potential mentors for our new ALAC members and regional leaders, and talk about what we expect of mentors, and as I said, we have a few people – Cheryl is among them – who I think can be considered as a professional in this business, and perhaps a bit of a tutorial and also a roundtable discussion of what we can do as mentors, what we are obliged to do, and try to make sure that our new people are well integrated and are not left to drift on their own and make all the same mistakes each individually.

---

And I'm wondering, is this an idea that has merit and we should think about, or again, it's an idea that we don't want to purpose because we don't think it's necessary or has no benefit?

Tijani, your hand is up. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. This issue of mentoring is very important for me, and I don't think that any program for mentoring will be of great help because mentoring is something that you do yourself without being asked to do it. If you are willing to help new people, newcomers, you will do it. This is what I did from the beginning with anyone coming new from the African region. Why African region? Because they are closer to us so they come to the African [elder]. They don't go to the others. That's all. But I do it with the newcomers from Africa right now.

Some of them never come to you, and they don't want to have any help. Even if you have a program, I remember for the summit of London, you remember we had a mentorship program led by Fatima. And we assigned people to mentors. I was one of the mentors. People who were assigned to me never came to me.

So, it is not having a program, assigning people to mentors, etc. It is being willing to help the newcomers and the newcomers being ready to ask questions or to come to the elder, and also to accept the help. Because sometimes you come to the newcomer, you try to help him, he don't say anything but he don't accept it. That's all.

---

So, I think it is more than a program, more than something that you organize. It is more a behavior, and perhaps we need to identify who has more ability to attract people or to help people. And perhaps we tell the newcomers that perhaps those people are the best to help you. But this is all. We had several trials in this way, and I don't see that a program can help more. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Tijani. Let me be clear, I was not suggesting we establish a mentoring program. I was not suggesting that we pair up individuals at this point. What I was suggesting is a small, focused discussion among people who want to be mentors and don't necessarily know what to do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Oh, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And we have some people among ours who are good mentors, and I think they can teach, the others can learn more what is effective and what is not effective in mentoring. So, I was not trying to put in the mentoring program. I was trying to address the problem with some of our previous mentoring programs.

Yes, for the last ATLAS, I was assigned to be a mentor for a few people. I didn't do a very good job of it. Some of them never contacted me. In one case, I think I contacted them but that was the only contact we ever had. And if someone were to ask me to put together a list of what are

---

the five things I'm going to do to help mentor them, I don't think I could have done that, and that's the problem I'm trying to remedy with the suggestion. Not doing the assignments.

But regardless of that, for incoming ALAC members and for incoming regional leaders, I think there is no choice. If they volunteer for the position, then they have to be willing to learn and understand how to do their position and what is required of them. I'll turn the call over to Judith and then Cheryl.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Hi. Yes. So, with the ATLAS II, it all depended on who your mentor was. It was my first time there and Glenn was my mentor, and what Glenn did is he didn't wait for people to reach out to him. He reached out to them, and then he held different meetings and worked on schedules and explained what the sessions were, how to get involved, and then he got people involved in doing some simple tasks. And that really got you involved.

And I know we had a couple people who got involved that way. I think it's the mentor's job to get in touch with the mentees, it's not the mentees' job to get in touch with the mentor. And that is also the case, and I think sometimes there weren't good matches, and sometimes there were.

And I think it's just that maybe the people who are mentors did not have training on how to be – on that they're supposed to reach out, they're supposed to find out what are the interests of new people, what is ICANN – maybe these people didn't know anything about ICANN, and

---

that was the case with some of us earlier. And I think that is the case – also, we tried in NARALO to do like outreach sessions, but it seems like you pick a time that people say is good but then they don't show up.

So, it seems like the only way of doing that is on the – have a call with three people or something like that, but that's a lot onerous unless you have a designated program, and that you don't give one person more than three people. But since we're not talking about that, unless we are talking about that, but if that's something we want to [start up,] I thought that was effective, that one person's in charge for three people, and then that's doable. At least it was when we did ATLAS. That's my piece.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Judith. If I may summarize, you're suggesting some people are good mentors, other ones if they're going to be mentors need training. I think you're supporting my proposal. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. I am also I guess supporting your proposal, but I'd be out of character if I didn't do my usual spiel. Mentoring is an overused and abused term. Most people say mentoring when they in fact mean other, far – in some cases – more valuable activities, including what Judith and some of you have just outlined, which is things ranging from onboarding through orientation to peer support to buddy systems to various other things.



I could spend two hours teaching you all what Mentoring is, capital M. I'm happy to do so if you want to make the time. But I think doing something is important. I think a train the trainer approach and a looking at the skillsets that your ALAC has and how they can be best distributed to make your next ALAC as effective as it could be is a worthwhile exercise. And eventually, I'll stop people using the term mentoring inappropriately.

And what was done at the ATLAS meeting was basically a buddy or guide system. It was not in the main a mentoring program. From it however, a couple of mentor-mentee relationships did develop, and that's a fine, fair and reasonable thing. But mentoring in its true sense is important, but it is not a program, it's a commitment, and anyone who's gone through that system will understand that you need to train your mentors, and that's also something that we probably need to look at.

But the easiest parts are looking at the skillsets you have, balancing those out, developing some peer support, some buddy systems, and making your next ALAC as effective as it could be. In addition to that, of course, you also need to look at similar activities in the regions as well, and it's certainly something that some of the regions do a better job than others, and some coordination there would be very valuable.

So, supportive, but I might have to try and retrain everybody with their nomenclature. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. And yes, I was using the term very loosely, and probably was talking more about orientation, buddy systems and

---

---

friendly reminders rather than true mentoring. I was using the term that we tend to use in relation to these activities, which is not necessarily accurate or appropriate.

I sense a positive attitude, but we need to clean up what it is we're going to talk about and how we do it, and I will take an action item to do that and come back with a more formal proposal, perhaps using the correct words this time.

Thank you. Next item on the agenda is the status of ALAC and regional selections, elections, appointments, etc., and I'll turn – well, I don't need to turn it over to Heidi because Heidi did a chart. If we could post the current status.

Thank you very much. What you have is the current status within all five regions of the various positions that are open: ALAC members, RALO Chairs, RALO Vice Chairs, Secretariats and NomCom delegates.

And you will see the different statuses. Green means that at this point, a selection has been made through one method or another, and it is now finalized. Yellow is there is an ongoing or will be an ongoing either vote to select, vote to state a preference, or vote or poll to agree with the single candidate. And those will all be completed presumably within a week or so, and the blue is a situation where the RALO has four candidates as a NomCom delegate. They have chosen not to evaluate them by the RALO and are passing it on to the ALAC.

I think we're going to have to come up with some decision, and I'll be talking to the RALO leaders as to how we can brief the ALAC to make that decision, given that in some cases these are people who are not

known to many of the ALAC members, and it's not clear we have a basis on which to make the decision. So, I think we're going to have to clean up that. There is no great rush to select the NomCom delegates. We do have a few months, so I will be talking to RALO leadership and other ALAC members on suggestions on how to do that.

In NARALO, I am not sure of the situation. I believe they are doing a selection to identify who is the preferred candidate, and then the results of that selection and both names will be passed to the ALAC. I believe that's the last I heard as to how that would happen. That may not be the case and they may simply be passing one name, but hopefully we'll have most of these positions identified in the critical timeframe.

The only positions that are critical on the short term is the ALAC seats, and we are obliged to at least try to have the ALAC members named prior to the annual general meeting so that when the NomCom selects their appointees for the regions where the NomCom seat is open and that is AFRALO, LACRALO, and APRALO that they know who the candidates are, so that they can try to balance them in. In this case, all of those regions are already have made their decision at this point – LACRALO still has to formalize their decision but it should be done in time.

I see we have a hand from Judith. Go right ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

NARALO is voting for ALAC positions and for NomCom delegates. The votes have been sent out already, the big polls vote have been sent out.

---

---

And the election, I think is open for the entire week. And then a choice will be made and then that choice will be sent to ALAC for their review. And that's what happening within NARALO.

My question is I don't understand an APRALO for the NomCom, I thought or maybe I'm not – I haven't looked at the Rules of Procedures that I thought that NARALO has to – they have to select one person and that NARALO cannot [inaudible] it to ALAC. They either have to have an election or do some choice. But I'm maybe wrong on that because I have not read their Rules of Procedures carefully.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Judith. No, I'm afraid you are wrong on that. The words in the both the Bylaws and the Rules of Procedure, the wording is very slightly but both the ICANN Bylaws and the ALAC Rules of Procedure say that the selection is made by the ALAC in coordination or in consultation with the RALO. There's no requirement for a RALO to name a single person. They often do but they don't necessarily. There have been cases before.

I don't think we've seen a case where there are four people presented before but that is certainly not against the rules. But as I said, we will have to look at how we make sure that the ALAC members can make an informed decision. My understanding for NARALO is that the intent is to provide both names to the ALAC with a preference. But I may be wrong in that and it doesn't really matter at this point.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, you are wrong. They are the big polls vote, the vote once set and the vote will decide and whoever wins the election on the vote, that name and the only name that's going forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Judith. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. Just a little quick on what you say. I think it's important to have all the names for the ALAC because it's not just the balance within the three representatives from one region, but it could be also more general balance for the ALAC. It's important to have the name from all the region before the NomCom starts to work, I think. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Any further comments? Cheryl, go right ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Very briefly. I agree with Sébastien and just wanted to point out that indeed, we have had regions [in] lists which in fact were more than four people for the ALAC consideration for Nominating Committee positions in the past. There is certainly no issue with four. We'll probably get a little bit concerned if [it is] 44, but four is not a problem. The preference or not is also another problem. Of course, the

---

ALAC has appointed in the past people, they were not put forward or even discussed at any point in time by the regions.

So that discretion for the ALAC is absolute. So regardless of what the regions do and held the proposed names are sifted, sorted or otherwise, hand it on to the ALAC. The ALAC can and will appoint to it pretty well [places] for region whether or not the ALAC had does names put forward by the region or even discuss it. Just want to make sure everyone agree on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you very much. Any further comments? Judith, just for the record, the wording that we're using I believe was discussed with the Chair of the RALO prior to doing that. This is not something that's done without the RALO's involvement. Each RALO as you see has chosen whatever way it deemed appropriate for this process.

Tijani, go right ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. I think that the color for the last rectangular in the table should be blue, not yellow. There is two names proposed to ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That is not the case. There is currently a decision process going on within the RALO. That doesn't mean both names will not be suggested, but there is currently a process going on whereas in the case of APRALO,

---

they have already decided not to have a decision process within the RALO.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Because I read here, "Yellow means consensus call. Vote ongoing."

ALAN GREENBERG: It means there is some process going there is.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: My understanding and I don't really wanted to debate what's going on in NARALO, but my understanding is NARALO is asking their members for a preference and that preference will be presented to the ALAC. As Cheryl said, even if a RALO says to put Li'l Abner as the delegate for the NomCom, the ALAC has the discretion to pick someone else altogether. So that is within the ALAC's remit. But at this point, the RALO has whatever way it chooses to present its candidate or candidates to the ALAC.

As we can see, each RALO has not always done the same thing. And that has been the case in the past. I don't think we need to debate that because the history is what it is.

Cheryl, is that a new hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is. I just want to point out as I realized you may not have covered the chat earlier. I was putting in the chat earlier and Satish was, I believe, reinforcing what I was saying that in my view, they shouldn't be in the APRALO line because [apparently] they also already have a current person in the RALO Secretary. That person doesn't need to be appointed or reappointed. That person can stay there until the leadership team in the region which is to dissolve the role, which it could do appoint another person or not. So, there is no "to be appointed shortly." If it changes its mind in a months' time or six months' time once we put someone else in [inaudible] it can do so. It is absolutely discretionary to the APRALO and it is absolutely nothing, in fact, to do with the routine other than for convenience selections I call the rest of the regions go through their Secretariat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Consider that box erased. Any further comments? Then we will go on. We are five minutes overtime at this point. I apologize for that. We have two items in Any Other Business. I will change the order even though Olivier spoke second because we did seem to have dropped the ball. There is a revised charter that was presented. It was supposed go to the ALAC for formal discussion and decision. It has not. It will in the very near future.

Olivier, is there anything else that needs to be said at this point? And Cheryl has her hand up.

We're talking about the CCWG Internet Governance. Nothing else.

---



---

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: Nothing else.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead. Thank you, Olivier. Acknowledging you said, “Nothing else.” Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Sorry, I don’t normally stop with the giggle with you two [inaudible] awful lot to each other.

I just want to pop on GNSO liaison hat here and inform you that the GNSO Council, which is also looking at exactly the same thing as to whether or not it will endorse the modified terms that you’re discussing, had an update briefing on this topic and some discussion on its meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup>. I can’t say that I am convinced as yet that there is a clear way forward that the GNSO will maintain itself as I am founding... What do we call them? You know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Chartering organizations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. The chartering organization for a Cross-Community Working Group per se. There is absolute belief and support for the principles of the conversations and the discussions and the work that the group does, that there is considerable hesitation on it being specific Cross-

---

Community Working Group vehicle. So I just wanted to let you all know that regardless of what you decide in terms of chartering organization status, there is still a possibility that the GNSO will not maintain itself as a chartering organization if the vehicle stays at the CCWG.

That's not sitting concrete, it's still being discussed. But it's certainly not [inaudible] me that it may not go that way. I just wanted to make sure you all are aware. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. I will suggest and I ask the staff to note this when we get around to wording something that when we do our approval, we approve that charter as revised or any other vehicle that has the same intent and mandate. I don't particularly care if we call our Cross-Community Working Group or a Cross-Community Task Group – a new name now I have coined. And with that, I will go over to the last item on the agenda and Dev to talk about the community onboarding pilot.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thank you, Alan. While the slides are being loaded up, just to give some brief overview. The community onboarding pilot program is a collaboration between ICANN organization – within the ICANN organization and the ICANN Community. So, more effectively integrate community members into their volunteer role. The program aims to create structured year round not meeting focused onboarding process led by – and for each of the community groups. By all the community

groups, I'm talking about the groups within the GNSO and the various ACs.

So the program consist of three pillars which is a timely welcome of the new community member. The second is the onboarding structured courses, materials and tools for individuals to learn about the community and how to participate. And the third part is mentoring which talks about individualized peer mentoring for selected individuals.

I just wanted to share as part of this onboarding pilot, members of the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee namely myself and Beran Gillen and Isaac Maposa, I've been working on trying to develop this onboarding approach. Just to illustrate what I'll talk about in the slides, we're kind of doing this is sort of a cycle: you want to promote At-Large, you then want to listen then understand At-Large. This person that [inaudible] At-Large and now understand a little bit more about At-Large can now join At-Large and therefore they can then become engaged in At-Large. Those engaged persons can then help promote At-Large, creating sort of a cycle.

So one of the tough challenges that was noted is that ICANN and At-Large has a whole set of terminology in terms of acronyms and so forth. It's a challenge to understand what these things mean. Our target audience which are end users, academia, civil society, consumer groups and even members of our existing At-Large Structures that are part of the At-Large community, they don't have an understanding of what these terms means and therefore have misconceptions. If so, then they really can't understand and then why did you [sit] here? To get involved in the first place.

---

---

So what we're working on is in terms of trying to overcome the challenges and promoting At-Large. So it's sort of a need to develop a series of audit presentations, lessons that could form a toolkit for At-Large community members and educating the wider public, the ALS representatives can use to educate members in their organizations, and it can be made available online and for offline for ease of use and access.

So today what we are trying to work on is to see [inaudible] audit lessons or presentations are like considering five call presentations. One of the start here which presents a [tail edge] [inaudible] topic slides depending on the audience.

A second one is what is the DNS and who coordinates all of this stuff namely the... What is the DNS? What is ICANN? What is ICANN Community?

The third one is policy challenges. This is in the DNS and that's the slide deck to help new or potential At-Large members understand what the policy issues are of interest and why end users should care about these issues and how as part of the At-Large community can become involved in those issues.

The fourth, that is the introduction to At-Large community which speaks to how... audit At-Large community, who we are, and who are involving the At-Large community to key activities and so forth.

So the next few slides, I'll just quickly and it's probably on sync for most people but I'll get – I'm sorry. I forgot to mention the fifth one which is navigating At-Large. This is get what the existing community members

---

and how they can find relevant information and possibly the At-Large activity. We have seen this dealing with the organizational challenges like how it is in each of the regions for the RALOs. I would say the operational challenges like how they use the [inaudible] subscribe to the conference call calendar, using Adobe Connect, those types of things.

We have done draft versions of the four of those five series of audit lessons presentation. And the link has been posted as by Isaac on the chat. I'm just going to quickly just show some slides and excerpt some and each of those things just to give an understanding of what it is about.

So to start here, we wanted to have like sort of like what kind of person you are. If you are new to ICANN then you go in this direction. If you are already a member of At-Large, go in this direction. If you are a member of another ICANN community, go in this direction.

All right. So what is the DNS? We're trying to act the typical slide deck is going to be what is the DNS, how does the DNS look, the stakeholders and the DNS and other stakeholders. And we try to find relevant infographics to try to make it as easy to explain as possible.

The policy, if it's in a DNS, the slide deck shows an interactive menu of the policy issues. And you maybe want to go full screen just to see over there. Then for each of those policy issues, we have a slide giving a policy summary. We have also made links to relevant videos. I'm talking about the policy summary.

Next slide it talks about why should end users care about this policy issue.

---

The third slide then shows how the At-Large would involve in this policy issue. It's past statements where they can get involved and what working group, etc.

In terms of the final one, the introduction to At-Large, well people may have seen this, this has been developed for quite some time in all engagement with Fellows, the NextGen. What was the [uphold] At-Large Structure, the key activity, the working groups on how you engage with At-Large.

So we have a link that Isaac has posted. We really want to get feedback on these documents. We're trying to finalize and put some work on this to update this document. And regarding the fifth one, navigating At-Large, we hope to post the draft very soon. But we just really wanted to share this with all the RALOs and of course with the ALAC to get feedback and comments and suggestions. I'll stop there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Dev. I have had some feedback that there is concern that some of the RALOs are not aware of what's been going on and I do want to suggest that we make sure that we contact both RALO Leadership and I presume you're working with the Outreach and Engagement Committee which has RALO representatives on it.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. First of all, what I will say doesn't have anything to do with what have been done by Dev, Isaac, and Beran. This

---

work is a wonderful work. I have had it before. I know what is inside and it is a very good work. Thank you very much for what you did.

But Dev you said that in the beginning that this is a collaboration between the staff and the community. This is wrong. This is a staff program made in the darkness behind the community. The staff did everything. They decided on the program, they [showed] the mentees because it's started as mentorship program. They chose the mentees. They chose the mentors. It is funny and nobody knows in the community what is happening here. We learned about it by accident. We complained about it officially by written and we had the response, the answer. I don't tell you what is in it.

This is something that we refused from the beginning because we said you are doing something for the community. You are doing it alone. We don't accept it. I am not against the mentees chosen at all. They know that I like them very well. But I don't understand why the community are not involved, the community is not involved at all. It was a real, real problem and everyone knows about it now, everyone. [Janice] first and then all of the senior staff because we said everything we had about it. This has nothing to do with what Dev presented or Dev or anything.

And second point, Alan, you said something wrong. But Dev is not presenting these as an Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee. He is presenting this as onboarding program which is different. Nothing to do with the subcommittee because Dev came in this program very late. This program started before him. Thank you very much.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you too, Tijani. I'll point out that the link that Isaac posted goes to the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee and it's listed under that group. So that is why I presumed there was a link between them. If there are in fact unconnected then I don't know how I can quite explain the positioning of this presentation on the wiki. Dev, any final words?

DEV ANAND TEELUNKSINGH: Thank you. I think the first part of comments, Alan, we've shared documents and the slides and the wiki link on all of the RALO's monthly calls to date for all five regions. And we both have presented it on the RALO's [inaudible] call and also now on this call, the ALAC, as well. We want to be continuing to look at this on the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee Working Group call, so again, to try and refine it because I think this is obviously an Outreach and Engagement call issue.

I note the concerns from Tijani and I agree. I've been late so I really did not understand if the true [inaudible] of this thing and so forth. I did come in very late. That's only weeks before the Hyderabad thing which was ICANN58 last year. I'll note that and I would say that there's a wiki going to be [inaudible] up for the community onboarding pilot which is not being [inaudible] right now. So you probably will see a lot more detail coming in the following days before Johannesburg. And I'll share that link once the wiki is fully [built out].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Dev. Seeing no more hands, I think we can... One last call for any further comments on this topic or anything or any other ones? And not hearing anything, I thank you very much for your attendance. We



---

have gone significantly over our time for that, I apologize. And I hope the meeting has been productive to the extent that people would like to give comments on how we can further refine these meetings and make them effective for everyone.

I look forward to your input. Thank you very much for your attention and I call this call to an end. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, everyone. Bye for now.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay, everyone, the meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you very much for joining today and wishing you all a good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Thank you. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**