

---

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone, and welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team (ALT) Monthly Call on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> of June, 2017 from 19h00-20h30 UTC. Today on the call we have with us Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Yrjö Lansipuro, Tijani Ben Jemaa, John Laprise, León Sanchez, and Julie Hammer.

We have no listed apologies. And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yeşim Nazlar, and myself, Evin Erdoğan. I will also be managing today's call. And I would like to remind everyone to please state your name for the record. And with that I'll turn it back over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. It's Alan Greenberg speaking. And I will try to remember to state my name but I may not succeed. I think we have a relatively short meeting this time. I've been proven wrong before but the formal agenda's only an hour long so we'll see how long it really takes. Is there any other business or any other comments on the agenda? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing.

Then we will start with the first item on ALAC Policy Activities. And I'll turn it over to Ms. Liang.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you, Mr. Greenberg. So, the ones that are in process right now, it's not that many. There's one statement on the Recommendations to

---

*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.*

---

Improve SO/AC Accountability. It's being ratified at the moment so just an active reminder for the people who haven't voted, please do so as soon as you can and the deadline's tonight.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there anyone on this call who has not voted?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. It's, in fact, Mr. Greenberg, yourself, and Maureen as well. So I just sent a reminder, you will have it in our inbox.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

ARIEL LIANG: No problem. So the next one is on the Draft Framework of Interpretations for Human Rights. I know Olivier reached out to a number of ALS's in EURALO and soliciting comments, and in fact, one of the ALS's proposed a draft, but the issue is that article 19 and they actually drafted this framework so I'm not sure what will be the next step for that and perhaps Olivier has some comment on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much, Ariel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Two things, we've actually had response from two of the ALS's, the other one being Bastiaan Gosling's ALS, ISOC Netherlands. Basitaan has been overworked and has told me, I think today or yesterday, that he would

---

be looking at this on this Friday, so, tomorrow. I've read through the whole thing, by the way, and I've gone through the whole set of proposals with Tatiana Tropina, who was also reporting on this in the Working Group.

And I'm not even sure that we actually need to comment on this, I'm quite satisfied with the Framework of Interpretation that is given there. Perhaps should we decide at some point whether we want to have a support of this framework, active support of this framework, or whether we don't want to have anything, you know, no comment, as such. But I'm looking forward to hearing from Bastiaan tomorrow and I'll see, based on his response, which way we go. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Alan. Julie Hammer speaking. Just on that point that Olivier just mentioned, the SSAC decided that it would make a statement of support just so that the CCWG is aware that there won't be any objections, or provided it doesn't change significantly, there won't be any objections when that comes to the final submission for approval from (inaudible) organizations. So that was the main reason why we decided to put in a statement. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The SSAC, as usual, has looked at this from a security/stability point of view and said they do not believe there are

---

any impacts, and therefore they support. We tend to look at things from a different point of view of saying, is this for the good of ICANN, for instance, or for the good of end users. And I wonder to what extent has anyone on this call, or anyone we're aware of, really looked at this from the aspect of what will be the impact? How will the world change if this framework is accepted? As opposed to where we are right now or where we were prior to the new bylaws being approved.

You'll recall that we got into the issue of human rights at least partially driven by the concept that since human rights are typically the responsibility of government, and we had the NTIA overseeing ICANN, therefore the NTIA would step in if we did anything naughty, essentially, something I think as highly unlikely that ever would have happened. But that's how we got here, but how we got here almost doesn't matter.

The question is, are there any impacts on how we or ICANN will be doing its business? Are we likely to see people filing human rights objections on issues that otherwise we might not have factored in? And I'm just wondering to what extent people might have actually thought about this through and said, will this change our life or is this just, as they say in North America, apple pie and motherhood, and it's all good? Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I thought that this specific thing was going to be dealing with the full framework from A-Z, and recommendations and the bylaws, etcetera, and how it

---

would actually change ICANN. But what this actually is about is just a Framework of Interpretation and it just defines a number of terms in a table and I think that the work is far from being finished. Here it basically just says, so that we can call a dog a dog and a cat a cat, let's define what a dog is and what a cat is.

And that's what really they've done. They have thrown a few points in there regarding how far they should go when it comes down to then having ICANN relating to human rights. And I understand there was a discussion that had taken place regarding a set of things called the Ruggie Principles. The Ruggie Principles were developed in Europe to be adopted by companies, so, corporations, the private sector organizations when it comes down to basically human rights. And inside that there is a requirement that a private sector organization should not conduct business with other companies or with states that do not respect human rights.

And that was rejected. It was rejected because ICANN needs to remain, and this is one of the weird ones, but ICANN needs to remain as neutral as possible. If one was to then say, well, ICANN needs to follow the Ruggie Principles that would have directly affected ICANN's business in the contracts it holds with any top level domain holders that are based in specific countries around the world, and perhaps even more so when it comes down to the ccNSO. So that was rejected, so the Ruggie Principles were not adopted on that. And so what's left of the framework, to me, seems to be more like first principles and common sense than anything that is bound to change the direction of ICANN dramatically.

---

But as I said, I'll wait for Basitaan's feedback tomorrow and I can certainly come back to everyone with some more recommendations as to whether we should write something in support. I certainly haven't seen anything that we should be against, put it this way. So it's either in support or we just remain quiet because we agree with it. I quite welcome the rejection of the Ruggie Principles, which I understand was a huge discussion point in the group, in the Working Group. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Interesting. Would we want to be told we can't have an ALAC member or an ALS from a certain country?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly, that's exactly, yeah, you've caught it. It's exactly the thing. And that's why it was rejected. But some wanted that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. Before we go to the queue, one of the things that dawned on me as I was thinking part of this through, was if the GAC, for instance, now gives advice that a certain TLD not be put in place because of some reason that the GAC supports, if the Board followed that, would that be violating freedom of speech rights, and things like that, for the people that want to say that word or use that word. I'm go on to Cheryl next.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl for the record. And thanks, Olivier, for what you were saying, particularly with the Ruggie Principles, which you're right, it was a relatively lengthy and indeed deep and robust interaction and debate, ad nauseam is I think the term I would use for some of it, but anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're not participating in the RDS PDP, you do not know what ad nauseam means.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, I don't know. I'll let you keep that one though. I would like to encourage the leadership team and the ALAC to say something in terms of support, and yes, I know it will seem a little bit like motherhood and apple pie, as Alan put it. But because of the deeply held beliefs of some sectors across the ICANN community, unless we have demonstrable support by the various sectors of the empowered community, I fear that we'll be asked to relitigate what has been worked on, and I think quite successfully, bringing out this Framework of Interpretation documentation. Sure, if we force another litigation then we would obviously go back to all the work that was, but there are many, many hours of that, and a lot can be lost in archives.

So, I'd just like to, even if it is a, we could remain silent option, to encourage you to say something for the record to show that the At-Large Advisory Committee, as part of the empowered community, is in support of it, and recognize that it is only ever meant to be a Framework

---

of Interpretation, because that is exactly what was specified as the mandate for Work Stream II out of Work Stream I. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. As Olivier said, please try to find in the Framework of Interpretation that is proposed now anything that may impact especially the content. Because ICANN is not about the content at all. And from the beginning, I am on the Working Group, and from the beginning this discussion was on the table. We don't have to have anything that may affect the content. We don't want someone to tell us, don't delegate this domain, because this will be use for, I don't know, for Taliban or for any political thing.

The content, what is inside, is not the environment of ICANN and it is clearly mentioned that it must be within the mission of ICANN, and the mission of ICANN doesn't have anything to do with the content. If something is in this Framework of Interpretation that may lead to this thing, that means that it is a big failure from me because I tried to be very careful. It is true that it is legal language, American language, etcetera, so it is not easy for me but I tried my best and I think we avoided that.

And I think I wasn't the only one in the group who was very, very careful about that. The Ruggie Principles was one of the ways that may lead us to make the content affected by the Framework of Interpretation. But



---

we avoided it, it was very clear, we rejected it and there was a majority inside the group that rejected it. And it was very easy because the Ruggie Principles are for the private sector, for business enterprise, ICANN is not. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I can thank Tijani for his additional comments here and, you know, just briefly summarize. The framework is a basic table that looks at the one bylaw that was passed during the Accountability Work Stream I, which was, it basically defines within the scope of its mission, within the scope of other core values, respecting, what does respecting mean, internationally recognized human rights, it defined what internationally recognized human rights, as required by applicable law, it defines what applicable law is, etcetera.

So it doesn't actually add anything to that one bylaw that was passed. What it does also then look into is, considerations from language from Annex 12 of the CCWG Report where it basically says, we have to consider specific human rights conventions or other instruments, if any, that could be used by ICANN in interpreting and implementing the human rights bylaw. And that's where it looks at the Ruggie Principles, it looks at a number of other principles, and it basically keeps it down to a minimum. So, as I said, not something of too much concern for us. And I think the work was done well, so, Tijani, you know, well done.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Just one comment, not affecting what we're saying, but just to point out, there are significant groups within ICANN that believe the domain name itself is content and by making any value judgements on that ICANN is veering into the area of managing content. Obviously that is a great disagreement with people specifically in the GAC who believe that is within our domain. So it's one of the interesting issues where human rights might be used in the future in an argument one way or the other. Alright, then it looks like it's well underhand. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. This is Ariel speaking. The last one is on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law. Just a quick update. The comment close date is July the 7<sup>th</sup> so we have more time to tackle this one and I know Olivier reached out EURALO ALS's and hoping someone will volunteer to draft something.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Christopher Wilkinson did draft something, not as a statement but as some comments. I had some problem with some of those because to a large extent he's expressing his dissatisfaction with where things are but not really addressing the issues raised in the specific questions. And I think if we're going to answer it at all, we need to address specifically the questions.

---

And if I understand that correctly, the reason we have this public comment is for people to comment on whether the changes that were made a while ago are adequate or not, and if not, what should we specifically do instead. His feeling is they were not adequate and we should simply do it right, but I'm not sure that really provides any guidance. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Having sat on this working group we reached the only possible place we could be. Yes, Christopher's upset about it, there's no way we're going to come up with, "we" being "ICANN's" going to come up with anything else. The whole problem with WHOIS is that it has to be solved more generically which is where, of course, the current RDS Working Group is happily beating the living crap out of each other. But the procedure, it's not going to change. It can't change. It can't change because, fundamentally, the WHOIS problem is the WHOIS problem. So that Working Group came up with the only thing it could.

And Christopher objected at the time and so, for that matter, did Stephanie. But in the end we voted for it because that's the best we could do. And it's a procedure that has never been used, probably never will be used, it's sitting there as another kind of problem created by WHOIS, and until the WHOIS whole issue is resolved, this particular issue is not going to be resolved. And so the outcome of that Working Group is the best it can do. And I'm happy to say that in about two sentences.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, my concern is, as I read it, and maybe I'm misreading this completely, this public comment was open because, for better or worse, there are people who believe something better can be done, otherwise we wouldn't be discussing it again. And yes, as one of the people who participated in the process, you believe that nothing more can be done, and the question is, I'm not sure the people who wrote that recommendation are the ones to comment saying, no, there's nothing more to be done. I think the people who are dissatisfied with it have to come up with some level of proposal to justify putting more work into it. And that's my concern and I haven't seen that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Would you want me to draft something along those lines?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. I just think we have to be careful that if we're going to put in a comment, it's got to have a comment that has some impact and meaning as opposed to saying we already did the work and we're tired.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, I'll have a look and figure out what's possible to say.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe it needs someone who hasn't looked at this recently to look at it and make sure the question, the way I'm interpreting what they're asking, is in fact correct. Maybe I'm wrong. I'm a little bit jaded also. You will recall that we were going to put a statement in, that this is

---

something I had asked Roberto to do that we never actually finalized, of saying, hey ICANN, get your act together, if people need exemptions, let's make it easy. And we changed the rules, it's not clear we made it easy.

So we were supporting some level of change before, it's not clear that we got what we were asking for as a group, maybe because we don't know the right mechanisms. In any case, feel free to look at it and anyone else with a fresh eye who would like to take a look at it, please do so. Go right ahead, Ariel. If there's anything more.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Just to say we have had some responses from a number of ALS's on this too and all they've done so far is to say, yes, we will come back to you with more shortly. But, you know, the general feeling in Europe, and unfortunately I haven't had the chance to even read that proposal, but what I've heard is that it doesn't satisfy the new requirements for the new GDPRs. Is that General Data...

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

We know it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That thing. It doesn't, and so they basically are saying, why in the world are we going forward with something which we already know doesn't satisfy this, it's a bloody waste of time and the ALAC should say that is.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And I am happy to say it is. I think it's a lot more productive if we can identify a way forward at the same time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That's true, yeah. And this is why I'll wait for their answers and I'll get back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, we have some time on it. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. The last one is that new public comment on the Issues Report - ccNSO PDP Retirement and Review Mechanism, closes on July the 10<sup>th</sup>. And I approached both Wafa and Maureen, and Maureen said she will take a look and advise the ALAC.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Alright. Oh okay, PDP Retirement, I thought you had said Requirement. So this is, how do we get rid of ccTLD's when they don't really exist anymore but they still exist on paper? Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:                Thank you. It's Maureen for the record. I think that we are supporting this because Wafa and I, we're invited to, so to say, and are on that actual Working Group. So I'm not quite sure whether we need to say more than that, that we do support it and we're part of the system.

ALAN GREENBERG:                Yeah, the history on Issues Report going out for public comment, they didn't used to, and they do now, and for better or worse, I think I have to take credit for it. Because at one point there was a GNSO Issue Report that we believed had errors in fact in it, and it went ahead anyway, because there was no process by which it could be commented on. So now Issues Report go out for public comment. So unless we identify something in it that we believe is either missing or wrong, I don't think there's any need for a comment on it.

So, I'm happy not to, but again, somebody else should be looking at this who hasn't been part of the process. I'll say I'll be glad to but whether I'll get around to it or not is not 100% clear. We do have a fair amount of time on this though. Ariel, back to you. That is not putting me down as a volunteer but I may choose to look at it if I get around to it.

---

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The last one is the one we actually discussed earlier. It's IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs. It's the Proposed Implementation of the Policy Recommendations. I don't recall we have made a decision on whether we're making a comment or not. So I'm just bringing this up again.

ALAN GREENBERG: I seem to recommend at some meeting suggesting that we don't want to make a comment, that it is just not worth our time. It is an issue that is so old at this point and so functionally irrelevant, that I have no interest in making a comment. I think that was said during the last ALAC meeting. If staff can verify that it was on the agenda, that it was already at public comment at the time of the last ALAC meeting. Ariel, do you know?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, it was on the agenda. I think that was the point that you said was mentioned, I think it was kind of left open ended because it's, you know—

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I did make a statement saying it was already three years old. I'm tired of it. I don't see any point. And I don't think we heard any objections, so I'm happy to say we have made a decision, unless someone else feels it has to be brought up again in some form.



---

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, thank you, Alan. And that's all for public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Any further comments on policy issues?

Then we'll go onto next item is, Updates from Liaisons, if any Liaisons have anything they want to bring to our attention? Go ahead, Yrjö.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah, Alan, thank you. This is Yrjö Länsipuro. Just to inform you that I posted today on the Liaison page, a note on the call for the ALAC Leadership Team with the GAC Leadership Team, and some ideas of what the agenda for our meeting in Johannesburg could be. It's only 45 minutes so we have to be fairly selective and what I propose is that we could discuss just three items.

One is that as both you, Alan, and Thomas said, at that preparatory call, is that we should perhaps get moving from mere discussions at this ICANN meeting, joint meetings, and go into some thought, where without creating any formal working groups or anything like that, we could somehow let a small group, or just the leads, the subjects leads, on those values to take a few things further. So this would be one item.

And then the substantive items would be just two. The new approaches on the New gTLD's, what you said at that call, for instance, perhaps the community applications will not figure out any more and the distinction between commercial and not-for-profit will be the same, and some

---

other things that came out from that side. So we could treat all these as one item.

And the other item would be under different regions with a briefing about the (inaudible). But also on both these items we actually identify a few people who could take this discussion further between ALAC and GAC, just in an informal way. As you said, go into a corner or bar or whatever and having coffee and discussing it further. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you very much. One of my real concerns, it's not an issue to discuss with the GAC, but one of the real issues is, for instance, on that call Thomas has some strong opinions on community applications and use of geographic names and things like that. But the issues that he raises never come up at the actual GNSO meetings.

Now, maybe the country name one will come up in the public sessions that we have in Johannesburg but I really worry that there are concrete suggestions being made but they're not being made in the forums where they're likely to be adopted. And I don't really know how to say that in a public meeting. However, Julie, you're next.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Alan. Julie Hammer speaking. Just to point out that the SSAC has issued four SSAC Reports in the last two weeks. SAC093 and 096, both as responses back to CCWG Accountability public comments on SO/AC Accountability and on the HR Framework. We've also actually sent in our response to the Diversity Questionnaire which was not

---

issued as a formal SSAC Report, and I think they were due in today. Or requested, not due in, they were requested to be submitted by today.

The other two SSAC Reports, 094, which is the response to the New gTLD round request for input, and the highly emotional Emoji SSAC Report 095. I know that there's been a few articles on that Emoji Report, some of which actually accept that the difficulties pointed out are valid but still go on anyway and say, oh, but they're working and so that's fine and we should be allowed to do it. But of course they don't actually object to the fact that emojis do not provide unique identifiers which is what domain names should be about.

And just by way of interest, and the illustration of the problem, is that the original version of the SSAC Report that was published actually had a rendering problem in it in one of the figures and I'm about to send out the corrected version of the outline, but it didn't correctly represent zero with joiners which is an illustration of how different applications such as Word introduce problems. So there's lots happening in SSAC at the moment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A question and a comment. One of the comments I read on the report was, we should accept the fact they're not going away and try to find some core minimal set of ones that are acceptable, you know, and make sure that they don't have different face colors and things like that. I find that exceedingly attractive and highly impractical, that I can't imagine that in the concept of emojis, we'll be able to come

---

up with ten that are accepted as valid and the rest not valid. So I'm just wondering, was that discussed at all in the work?

JULIE HAMMER:

I wasn't part of the work party until the very late stages when I came to realize how great an interest ALAC would have in this. So I wasn't part of those initial discussions, but just from my understanding that I've gleaned since being involved, that the problem with that is even if you intend to use the same restricted set of particular emojis, different applications, different browsers, will render it differently to the (inaudible). And so it makes it problematic. It's not consistently rendered by different applications.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, neither are Latin characters, however, with different fonts.

JULIE HAMMER:

Yeah, so anyway, good point, and I'll put it to the work party and just see what their thoughts are on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. My other comment is do we really have any hope of this succeeding in a world that truly believes that Pokemons are real and goes searching for them in parks and around the city?

---

JULIE HAMMER: I think the really, really important recommendation is ICANN don't use this at the TLD level. But at the second level, you know, it's probably too late to reign it in, but possibly having pointed out the problem, some responsible GLD's might restrict it, but, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Are there any further comments on this? I know Cheryl had her hand up, I presume is Liaison. But Cheryl, if it's on this subject, go ahead, otherwise we'll go to John.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go to John.

JOHN LAPRISE: Hi. John Laprise for the record. I hear everything on this and I support the effect but I fear that this is going to be an issue that's going to be revisited because we have languages like Chinese which are picture graphic in nature, and so emojis are not so far away from them, and they have a couple billion users who are comfortable with it. So, I think we're tabling this but it's going to change in the future.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I always wonder what would happen if I set my browser to use one of the really weird fonts for Latin characters. Sorry, I missed that, John.

---

JOHN LAPRISE: No, I was just saying, who speaks Pirate if you set the language properly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl for the record. And I just have to invoke the mantra, universal acceptance, but there you go. Yeah, not a lot has happened from the GNSO world, well, the GNSO Council world, more to the point, a lot's happened in GNSO world, but not by Council, since my update of the meeting of the 18<sup>th</sup> of May at the last ALAC meeting.

But, pen and paper, if you use such a thing, or fingers to the keyboard, at the ready. I've received a draft agenda for the Monday 26<sup>th</sup> of June, GNSO Working Session, and because there's a number of updates which a number of you serve in PDP processes for, I thought I'd at least give you a little advanced notice of the sketched in times, so we might take account of this in the planning of your detailed agenda, Alan. So, usual boring opening stuff until 09:30.

Then the gTLD Subsequent Procedure Working Group status update is in the 09:30 to 10:00 o'clock slot, so Alan, that's you and I. Then there's just an update on KSK Rollover, that's neither here nor there. Those of you who have an interest, which would be Olivier and Cheryl and Alan, in the PTI Budget for FY-19 is 10:30 to 10:45. Then RPM's is 10:45 to 11:15. And RDS is 11:15 to 11:45. Then it's another briefing by GSE.

Maureen, we're having a working lunch with the ccNSO, in preparation for our joint meeting with the GAC at 12:15 to 13:30, so you need to be

---

available for that. And then the IGO Curative Rights is on at 02:00 til 02:30. So, I just wanted to let you all know that now and I will forward that as very much draft, and it may change, to Gisela, so she's got that as a rough beware, as with the other agenda items. That's it from me.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Gisela and Heidi, please, because Heidi's the one who works with me on the detailed ALAC agendas. Any further comments? I think we should just give up trying to have any ALAC meetings and just go to all the other meetings. Life would be a lot simpler. I hear no objections, we just made a decision, we have no ALAC meetings in Johannesburg. Unfortunately the ALT cannot make such decisions. But Olivier agrees. Alright, any further comments on Liaison reports? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing.

We will go on to the next agenda item, the At-Large Review. We have ten minutes allocated to this, I don't think we have ten minutes of discussion, but perhaps either Holly or Cheryl can summarize what happened on the leadership call with MSSJ and then we'll talk a little bit about what we might do in Johannesburg. Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay, I'll take it over. First of all we discussed timelines. There will be hopefully a 45 minutes meeting in Joburg just with the working party. It's not really for content, it's just going to be looking at an outline of their requirements that have to go to the Board, how we're going to input content and some timelines. The timelines, then our input into our response, have to be really finished by the end of August, we have

---

to agree to all of that by the end of September, and therefore our report should go to the Board. The aim is for all the documentation to go to the October meeting, so whatever we're going to say should be complete by September. That's the timeline.

Now what goes to the Board, and we hope it's the October reading, are going to be three things. The ITEMS Report, as we know, is complete. The Public Comment Summary, that will be done by ICANN staff. And the third element is going to be two parts. The first is, our response to the recommendations, and then the proposed implementation steps. The recommendations are going to be in what's called a Feasibility Assessment Implementation Plan.

Now, that includes two parts, as I've said, the first is against each recommendation, it's going to be either, we totally agree, we partially agree. And in many cases that's going to be we agree with the issue identified, we don't agree with their proposed solution, we have to say why. The third would be we do not agree with the recommendation, and again, we have to say why. For the areas where we only partially agree or don't agree, we have to state our alternative proposals and how they will address the issue.

The next part of what we put to the Board will be the implementation steps including prioritization, some dependencies and resources needed, so that can go into budget, and finally, a proposed timeline, which, it's recommended there be a phased approach. To actually get our input, "our" being "ALAC" totally, but "working party" particularly, we need a wiki page. Ariel has done as requested and thank you very much.



---

And really, it only contains the skeleton of what will be required—clearly we all have to input into that—and our master document that’s been worked on. That’s basically what we discussed at the meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Holly. One comment that I disagree with what you just said, and I disagreed at the meeting. As you said, if we disagree with the recommendation, we have to describe our alternative implementation to address the issue. I think we have to address what we are doing. The Review has identified some problems that we have known are outstanding for ten years and we have not been able to fix them. I don’t want to pretend that we are going to magically in the two and a half months come up with the definitive solution.

So, if we are simply saying, yes, we are still addressing it and struggling with the problem, then I think we have to be honest enough to say that. I really don’t want to set expectations that we’ll then be measured against that we are proposing definitive implementations to address issues, when in fact, those issues are really difficult ones and may not be addressable. Period. I mean, history will prove whether that’s true or not. But I don’t want to set expectations incorrectly, because we’ll be measured against it afterwards. And I won’t be Chair at the time we’re measured but someone else will be around and have to bear the brunt of that and I don’t think that’s fair. That’s part number one.

Part number two is, when are we going to announce to the Working Party and the ALAC that we are welcoming comments? As you know, I’ve already put some comments on paper on this, and I don’t want to

---

be the first to go into the wiki and put my comments in as the definitive ones, but we do need to get this work started. And if no one else does it in a while I will put mine in but I hope that they're not going to be the first ones or the ones that start the discussion off. I would prefer they not be. So, what timeline are we looking at to start this discussion? Are we waiting for Johannesburg or doing it before?

HOLLY RAICHE:

No, Alan, we had to wait until the wiki. Now, I just got an email yesterday from Ariel, late, and it said the wiki was all set up. I haven't had a chance to look at it. I'll look at it this morning. And if it looks fine, which I anticipate it will, then at that point I'll send an email saying, this is the wiki, this is what we have to do, and just summarize what I've said, and say, okay, we can start comments now. But we didn't have the facilities up until yesterday to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Holly, I wasn't criticizing, I was just asking what the timeline was.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, well the timeline had to start with the wiki.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I understand, I just didn't know the timing at all. Cheryl, go ahead.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was actually going to update you on the status of the Wiki whereto next, so that's done. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thanks. Any further comments? Then I look forward to people commenting on this. I want to caution us, everyone, and I'll do this in a more public forum also, that whatever we commit to we are going to have to try to implement. So I prefer to err on the conservative side rather than give us something that we are going to be struggling with for the next three years to implement. Just a thought. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Sorry, that one requires me to respond with my ancient hat on. We implemented, with the exception of some (inaudible) regional leadership and regional behaviors, on everyone excepting one of the last lots of Review's recommendations. And that was a much more difficult task, dare I say, because we had no role in influencing what was or wasn't going to be accepted and recommended for implementation.

That was just the middle group of Board appointed committee managers all sort of, you know, had their drubbers with the Independent Examiner's Report and we just had to basically suck it up and do our best. So, the fact that we have this opportunity means that what you have just asked for should be a far more achievable and less stressful task. Yes, we do need to be intelligently conservative. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, yes, and having lived through that process, albeit not as Chair, it wasn't a lot of fun. And we in our community tend to sometimes be rather optimistic about how easy it is to do things, until we actually go looking for volunteers to do them. So that's the perspective that I lend in saying let us make sure we're conservative. Anything further?

Then we will go onto ICANN 59 which is looming close. Who will take this one? Heidi? I don't see Gisela on the call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, hi everyone. Sorry, Alan, I thought you were going to go ahead and do that. So I'm not going to go through the schedule. Thanks for posting it up here. But I think we can move on, Alan, if you would allow, to go ahead and actually just go do the topics. We had a call earlier this week with Leon, Beran and Alan, and we made excellent progress on discussing some of the topics and some of the speakers. So if we can go ahead and do that. So, Alan, do you want to review this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh sure, I can do that. These are the items that at one time or another we have talked about doing. Now, before I start, Heidi, have you added up these numbers and what is the sum if we use the larger number for each of these sessions?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I have not, but on the call I did so and it was approximately around six and a half, seven hours. Actually, plus we kept adding, so I think we're going to be at that nine and a half, because we just added this morning the David Conrad, DART, for 45 minutes. So we're going to be at that amount. And now we also have Göran, we just heard from Göran who's just confirmed that he's going to be speaking as well. Oh, there he is, yeah. So we have him there for 30-45 minutes for At-Large and AFRALO on rural connectivity.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Holly, do you have something to say before we start going over the list?

HOLLY RAICHE: I have something to say on the first item.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then you may as well say your say.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, the way this is set out, it looks like I'm talking about Public Interest Concerns. What I was proposing to do was have a session on PIC's, on a little bit of the history of PIC's and on where we are now and on what's happening in the subsequent procedures. Really kind of, both an opportunity to bring people up to speed on what a PIC is and then where that fits in to the subsequent procedures and what's recommended. So, I realize that says Public Interest and it should be

---

Commitments, but if that's what that item means then that's what I'm doing, it just isn't clear to me.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, I was going to address that, but now that you've had your say. We did discuss this, remember, and I pointed out that it's not just Public Interest Commitments, PIC's, because Public Interest issues are addressed in different ways for different types of domains. For instance, for community domains they are not addressed as Public Interest Commitments, they are addressed as commitments the registry makes into how its operations will be run.

Which is different, it may have the same net effect, but it's a different mechanism. Which is why we're not using PIC's as such but the concept, the Public Interest Concerns, how do we address, making sure that the domains, such as, the kinds that the GAC and the ALAC spent extensive time on, where these are highly regulated industries and we believe that there are Public Interest Concerns associated with them, how do we get them addressed. So, it's a slightly wider topic than PIC's but it is the same subject with just different words for perhaps different types of domains.

And of course, we don't know whether they will be PIC's for the next set of domains, of TLD's, but we as ALAC certainly have strong feeling that we have to address the issues that were addressed by PIC's, even if they're not PIC's. So that was the reason I did not use the three capitalized words, because that tended to narrow the subject, whereas I think we want to make sure it's more generalized.

HOLLY RAICHE: Can we talk offline because I don't know I can do all of that in 90 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure you need to do it all, but yes, we need to talk offline. And the meeting is creeping up and so, yes, we do need to work on that. Sorry, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl for the record. Holly, I just wanted to ask you, what is, very briefly, your understanding of what the Subsequent Procedures Working Group is recommending on PIC's?

HOLLY RAICHE: There is a meeting in about one hour on Subsequent Procedures which I was hoping to get to. I will be talking offline to Avri just to have an update. I've gone through their newsletters and everything to see where they're up to with the range of issues at this stage.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right, fine. I would suggest, if I may, Holly, that you won't have information to share with the ALAC other than the fact that it is a topic of discussion in the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. But you sort of indicated in your precis that there was some decisions and I've been on all of those work groups and I kind of know where we're up to.

---

---

So, that's all. Just wanted to make sure you were getting the right end of the data. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

No, it's an update. It's what the issues were, where we've got to, and what's on the table now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, the problem, Holly, is there's nothing on the table right now, that's the point. But the reason I'm strongly supporting having this session is I think we need general understanding in the ALAC on what the issues are. And talking about the GAC concerns, both the fact that we've supported some of the concerns and the fact that they were over-reaching, supporting the concept of how do we get Public Interest issues understood in a world where the contracted parties want to simply run their businesses, and not have anyone interfere. I want to raise the issues.

Let me step back for a moment. We have been criticized, rightly so, that we have spent far too much time on process within the ALAC face-to-face meetings and not enough on policy issues. We are in a fortunate position right now. There are no hot issues on the table that need our addressing. Yes, there are some associated with making ALS's more effective and things like that. But because they're almost pending because of the Review, we can put them on the back burner at the moment. And with the exception of the Review itself, we have very little real operational issues that need to be discussed face-to-face.



---

So, I've taken an executive decision, which was supported by Leon and Beran, that in terms of scheduling sessions, we are going to put a lot of focus on making sure that our people go to the other sessions that are scheduled not against us, and understand what's going on in the area of gTLD's, and the area of country geographic names, and a number of the other issues, privacy issues, that are going to be on our table in the next year or two. So we will put a lot of effort and a lot of our time in trying to get people up to speed.

And I view this one as getting our people up to speed on issues that may not be espoused by the GNSO in general, but are important to us. So it's not so much getting them up to speed on the PDP but on the issue. So when the issue does come up, and it will, that it's not just one person that participates in the PDP who is in a position to comment on it. So that is just one part of that effort, and you'll see as we go through the list, and I'd like to actually go through the list to look at some of the other issues.

The next one is we talk about domain name abuse continually. I don't have a strong feeling that the majority of the people we're talking about, and I'm focusing on the ALAC and the regional leaders, really know what we're talking about. Really understand how domain names are used in phishing and things like that. And I have asked, but is not yet confirmed, that one of the people who spends his life doing this, give us a talk for about 30 minutes. I asked Greg Aaron who's part of the Anti-Phishing Working Group and involved in a whole bunch of other activities related to domain name abuse, if he will give us a bit of a tutorial and have some discussion on that. These are not in any order other than the order we thought about them in.

---

The next one is some time on the CCT Review Team, that's likely with Carlton, Kaili and Jonathan Zuck. Again, to update us on where they are right now. They will have spent two days at their meeting and hopefully will be a lot closer to having a final report. And I think that should be of great interest to us.

We have a meeting with the SSAC. And is Julie still on the call? I'm not sure if Julie is or not. I'm not sure what the topic is on the SSAC agenda but SSAC meetings are always fun. And they've asked for 30 minutes.

As you know, there's a new Consumer Safeguards Director that has been hired, Bryan Schilling, and he will be meeting with us, hopefully, and talking a little bit about what he sees as his role and hopefully there'll be some interesting discussion on that.

You'll notice a lot of these ideas all sort of join together.

We have a meeting scheduled for the At-Large Review, as I already mentioned. That is the non policy issue.

I would like to spend, in the wrap-up session, a debriefing with the ALAC and regional leaders as to what was useful, what was not. This will be a different meeting and I think there should be some good discussion on it.

Next one is something we haven't talked about here, and again, I took a perhaps unilateral action to ask Göran if he would talk to us. If you remember correctly in his previous life he ran the regulatory agency in Sweden. One of the things Sweden did is declare internet access, and I

---

think broadband access, as a human right. And then it was up to the regulator to implement it.

And he somewhat, perhaps tongue in cheek, says he failed, because there were a few dozen families that were not connected. But they have done something which is relatively unknown and I think within our community, although connectivity is not an issue, that is within ICANN's remit, it is an issue of great interest to large parts of our community. And I asked him if he would tell us about his experience and perhaps have some interesting discussion on it. Given that we will have the African ALS's there and connectivity in Africa is something of great interest, I thought this might be an interesting session.

Again, not quite on ICANN's remit but I thought it would be of interest. And unless anyone objects strenuously, then we will try to hold that, assuming we can find a time that Göran will commit to spending a modest amount of time with us without canceling at the last moment, which unfortunately often happens. And yes, Heidi says she spoke to him, she spoke to Göran and he's happy, and he sent me a message saying he's happy to do it, but actually making that happen might be something else. But we will try.

A short meeting, again, I guess this one is probably not policy but I think we can't avoid doing it, is an initial discussion on ATLAS III. And it's two years away but we have to start thinking about it. And I would like to raise the issue that is perhaps driven by some comments within the At-Large Review, that we start thinking about who do we include in this?

---

Do we just blindly include representatives of ALS's and one unaffiliated member per region? Or do we look at perhaps trying to bring in people who will be able to contribute more and gain more from the meeting, that may not be the formal administrative representative from the ALS? And I think that's a discussion we need to start having and I don't think it's one we'll come to closure on really quickly. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Tijani speaking. I heard you, Alan, and I think it is a dangerous way to go, because do you know why most of our ALS's are not interested? It is because they don't see us. They don't meet people. They don't meet with the other ALS's. And so they are disinterested. So, those summits, those ATLAS, are a way to bring all of the ALS representatives together, and then to give them more motivation to be more active, to participate more.

And perhaps to have, how to say, to have the will to be more active once they are together and they are meeting together. So if you begin to select from them, people, it will be a real divide, and I don't think it will be helpful for our community, not to lose a huge number of them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I understand that, and as I said, I think it's a discussion we need to have. I'm not saying what the answer is. The counter argument in my mind is that I can name a number of ALS representatives who have been to both summits, to the two or three GA's that have been held since the beginning of At-Large with RALO's, and their contribution stays the

---

same. And I'm not sure that it's the best way of using ICANN's funding and the best way to get real contributions from people.

And I'm also equally worried that if we are successful with individual members, that identifying a single representative of them, perhaps, as some regions do, by voting who it is that's going to be the person, does not necessarily make the most productive use of the resources. So I think it's a discussion we need to have. I'm not dictating how it goes and I don't think we can blindly simply do what we've done before, just because that is what we dreamed up the first time around. I think we have a longer history than we did in Mexico City when this subject first came up. And I think we need to learn from our history. That may be we end up doing the same thing, but I think it's a discussion we really need to have and need to be rather pragmatic about it.

Okay, the next item on the agenda is, where are we. Oh, we've allocated some time with Rinalia and Leon to the extent that he wants to wear his future hat.

We have meetings with the GAC and the ccNSO. Do we have a meeting or not, it was not clear when we discussed this if there was a meeting scheduled.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, Alan, this is Heidi. Maureen has said that the ccNSO has said that they do not have time.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, fine. That one's gone. Alright, we are tentatively saying we should meet with GSE and DPRD. Perhaps David Olive, but I'm not quite sure on the subject so I'm looking for input on that one.

We have asked David Conrad to speak about the domain abuse reporting tool. Again, that's on to the other subject.

And that's about it. I think that's pretty well going to fill up our time. There's obviously some housekeeping to be done and a little bit of discussion in the wrap-up session on the empowered community and the decision we're going to have to take. But we can't actually take the decision until Thursday, midnight, so the decision will be taken electronically afterwards. This is on the fundamental bylaw changes currently being proposed.

Comments or thoughts? Does it sound like a good meeting? Anything we've missed? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing. Heidi, are there any other issues that you have to discuss? I still have one other item on pre-ICANN meetings.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

No, just basically that movement with the AFRALO General Assembly is coming along very nicely. I think it'll be a fantastic program. Thank you to Tijani and the Organizing Committee for that. Also outreach, for the first time AFRALO will have its own outreach table, which it will be asked to share with some of the RALO's and perhaps some of the other SG's. But we're going to have staff, Silvia and Mario, working with AFRALO on scheduling some of the outreach. And I think it will also be a

---

good way to see and start planning for the IGF outreach later in the year in Geneva. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. The only other item is just a heads up to the extent that we're needed on pre-ICANN meetings. As most of you probably know, the meeting formally starts on Monday. There will be a CCWG Accountability meeting on Sunday. The CCT Review Team will be meeting Saturday and Sunday. There is some probability that the RDS Review Team may be meeting Saturday and Sunday. That's somewhat problematic because Carlton, who is in the CCT Review Team, is meeting in his meeting on Saturday and Sunday.

And I, who am in both the CCT, the RDS Review Team, and the Accountability is meeting on Sunday. I arrive on Saturday morning early enough to attend most of the meeting on Saturday if necessary. If there is a Saturday meeting I will not change my travel, I'm just going to suck it in and work directly. I can't leave any earlier because of other commitments at home. Which, if that does happen, that means I have zero planning time on the ground for the ALAC meeting, which is going to be interesting. It's going to be a rather tight schedule.

Certainly if the RDS group meets there's going to be some really strong conflicts and I'm not quite sure how we're going to address this. It may mean, however, that I'm not going to be very much in the Accountability meeting, and we'll have to cover that one way or another. Yes, go ahead.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I've given up on trying to stay in the Adobe Connect room, and I've been bumped out so many times by my poor internet connection, that I've literally given up. And to that end, Tijani tried to send me a private message earlier on. I never got beyond me responding, hi, so Tijani, if you needed to have me react to something if you could email me, that way you'll get a reply from me. I'm sorry, I wasn't ignoring you, I literally can't see the conversation.

Just on that, Alan, if you do need to be spread very thinly on the Sunday, obviously I'm sure Leon and I will do our best to make sure that the right flags are waved, and we can just keep you in the loop in a back channel on Skype or somewhat. I'm sure we will overcome. But yes, it's getting a little silly, isn't it?

ALAN GREENBERG: And you haven't heard, it's conceivable that, well, you were talking about ATRT. We have other people who are involved in Accountability talking about ATRT. It's conceivable the ATRT meeting will be convened in Johannesburg. Now, we haven't selected our members yet. The applications closes tomorrow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 24 days and the applications close in more than 24 hours, that's going to be interesting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, and at this point, last time I looked there were no GAC applicants yet. So I think it's going to be extended again. But I have no inside



---

information on that. I cannot imagine an ATRT being convened with no GAC participants.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, but I can imagine if an ATRT is convened, then the GAC will find people to attend.

ALAN GREENBERG: After the fact, yes. Life is interesting is all I can say. Any further comments on ICANN 59?

I have no specific comments on the account on Review of the ALAC meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Unless someone wants to raise something, we have no other business. Is there anyone who has a reason to extend this meeting?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hell no, that gives me coffee time before the next meeting starts.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: This meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much for your participation. A kind reminder to please disconnect your lines when leaving the AC room and bridge. Thank you very much and have a wonderful rest of your day.

---

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]