

GISELLA GRUBER:

Good morning and good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Tuesday the 25th of July at 21:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Javier Rua Jovet, Kaili Kan, Sébastien Bachollet, Andrei Kolesnikov, Baastian Goslings, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Seun Ojedeji, Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Lansipuro, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Sarah Kiden, Vernatius Okwu Ezeama, John More, John Laprise, Ricardo Holmquist, Matthew Rantanen, Edem Nunekpeku, Judith Hellerstein.

On the Spanish channel, we have Maritza Aguero, Wladimir Dávalos, and Alberto Soto. On the French channel, we have Aicha Abbaad, Guiguemde Jacques, and Gabdibé Gab-Hingonné.

Apologies today noted from Marita Moll, Maureen Hilyard, Roland Yarbrough, Holly Raiche, Leah Symekher, Glenn McKnight, León Sánchez, and Ali Almeshal.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yeşim Nazlar, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Gisella Gruber. We also just have Aida Noblia and Nkem Nweke who just joined the call.

On today's call, we have Spanish, French and Russian interpretation. Our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Veronica and Marina, on the French channel Camilla and Aurélie, and on the Russian channel, Yuliya and Maya.

If I could please remind everyone to please state your name every time you speak to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other channel,

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.

as well as for the transcript, 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, Gisella. Is my volume okay? I'm on a different phone line and a different phone instrument. Everyone hear me okay, including the interpreters? Hearing no complaints, I presume I am.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, Alan. I hear you very weak, very low.

ALAN GREENBERG: Very weak. I'll try talking louder. Is that any better?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's better now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I will try to keep my voice up and annoy everyone here. Are there any comments on the agenda, or Any Other Business you'd like to add? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I will assume the agenda is accepted as displayed. And the first substantive item is actions items. Heidi, you said there's not much to do, but is there anything to do?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, everyone. So, there are a few. We have [pages] hyperlinked to the agenda, but there is nothing that looks urgent. So, I would just encourage the ALAC members to take a look at that page, and if you see your name, we can move forward on that. Again, we're just looking at the ALAC sessions, ALAC regional leaders working sessions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If there's nothing else, we'll go on to the next item. The next item is standard policy item on our list, and I'll turn the call over to... Is Ariel on the call? I don't see her name, but maybe I'm scrolled down. She is. So, Ariel, if you can take us through the items on the policy agenda, and I'll talk to the very last item on the RSEP for the Belgian TLDs.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. So, for the public comment, we have only two that we need to discuss, and in fact, one is a closing very soon, actually the end of this week. It's on the draft framework for the registry operators to respond to security threats. I did send a couple of e-mails asking for input, but nobody has volunteered to write a statement on that, and just need affirmative response whether ALAC needs to respond to this public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: When did this open?

ARIEL LIANG: This opened a long time ago, actually. And I did send e-mails a long time ago as well. It opened on June 14th, before the meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, wondering why we didn't discuss it in Johannesburg then. But it doesn't matter if we didn't. Has anyone had a chance to look at it? And I must admit I was not even aware of it. Has anyone had a chance to look at it, and is there anything in it that we believe needs addressing? Or would anyone like to look at it in the next day or so and give us some quick positions? Seeing no volunteers, I guess we're not really worried about any security [inaudible] or not.

And we have Olivier. Thank you, Olivier. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I can certainly ask one of our At-Large individual members from Europe, Tatiana Tropina, who's a cybersecurity expert, to give us her feedback on that. And so I'll take it as an action item to ask her about this, and I will come back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please. If we are going to say something, we have six days. So, at this point I think it will need to be urgent if we do anything at all. But yes, thank you very much for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I wasn't aware of this one either. I don't know how I missed this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not quite sure how it slipped by. Alright, next item is GNSO operating procedures and ICANN Bylaws. This one goes on until August 10th. In general, it is our practice to look at these briefly, but not comment on other groups' procedural matters. But Cheryl, I see your hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. And certainly wearing my GNSO liaison hat here. I'm aware that Holly has asked – and she's not here today, so I'm trying to channel her – that we consider reviewing this and putting in some sort of comment. I spoke against that when she raised it as an option in the recent APRALO regional meeting, and I'm speaking against it again now. Not only for the exact same reasons as you have just outlined, Alan, that it is not our practice to do so unless there's something extraordinary and inflammatory in such proposed procedures, but because this is essential housekeeping to bring in line the GNSO operating principles so that it works with the Empowered Community and the changes that were made to ICANN Bylaws as a result of the transition work. So, I don't think we need to say anything. I have reviewed it, I am very aware of every dotted I and crossed T, and I recommend you do not make a comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Is there anyone on this call who would like to disagree with Cheryl? Then we've made a decision, there will be no statement on that particular item. Thank you. We'll now go on to the last one.

The last one is an RSEP. Now, for those who are not familiar and haven't been reading the e-mails for the last couple of weeks, RSEP is the procedure by which a registry can request a change to their contract. The process is it is reviewed by ICANN. If ICANN does not see any immediate security, stability or competition issue, then they approve it, presuming the change actually requires a contractual change. The contractual change will then also go out for public comment.

I raised the issue because they were removing several grace periods. A grace period is a period when certain things can happen or cannot happen. One of them was an [ad] grace period which in theory could affect registrants but in fact does not affect registrants the way it is currently implemented. As far as I know based on the comments we had, the other grace periods they're deleting do not affect registrants at all. So, I would suggest we do not need a comment on it.

Now, along the way, there were a fair amount of discussion on whether 15 days is sufficient, and there were several people who felt we should make a comment that 15 days was not sufficient. I have no problem with us commenting on that, but this is not the proper place. This comment will be read by people looking at whether there are security, stability or competition issues associated with the TLD.

I also raised the issue that one of the things that is not a reason for refusing the RSEP are consumer safeguards or registrant safeguards, and that's again something we could certainly discuss in the future. It would require a PDP to change, because the RSEP is a consensus policy that was developed many years ago. It was pointed out – I was talking to ICANN staff about it however, and they did point out that since any

RSEP will eventually result in a contractual change which does go out for public comment that we would have a chance at the public comment period to talk about consumer issues.

They also did note that as far as we can tell, there has never been an RSEP which had those kind of implications in it. So, at this point I don't believe we need to address this particular RSEP with any sort of comment and I don't think there is a need going forward to worry about it as a prospective PDP. Although if that is an issue that people would like to pursue, that's something we could do in its own right.

Are there any comments? There were a number of people who did comment on this issue on the mailing list, so I'd like to open the floor if there's anyone with any further comments at this point. Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we will go on to the next agenda item. Thank you, Ariel.

The next agenda item is –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead. Olivier, go ahead. Sorry. If your hand is up, it didn't get to me yet. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Sorry, Alan. It took me a little while to find the right button to press to get my hand up. No, just to comment, I think your analysis is correct. And I've followed this quite closely. It's not the right time for us to comment on this, but certainly, I don't know what the procedure would be to put this on the side and for us to address this at the correct time, because I do have this concern that you've raised about how little time is there and what limitations there are for the ALAC and for the end user interests to be defended.

And to me, it looks like an open door, or a potentially open door for some kind of gaming. I'm not quite sure how, but I just wouldn't want to see this being used ultimately to change contracts in a way that would negatively impact on end users without end users being able to somehow fight back. That's all. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Thank you. That was my concern also, and I must admit I forgot, and maybe we need to verify that my sources were correct. But I believe they are correct in that any eventual contractual change does go out for a formal public comment as opposed to the RSEP which is not the same process as a capital P capital C Public Comment. So, I have less of a concern. In any case, if the RSEP were to be changed, it would require a PDP. So, if there are sufficient things that need to be changed for one reason or another, I have no problem with us initiating such a process.

But I think one of the first questions that would be asked in the GNSO is, is the problem we're trying to solve a problem that we're worried

about? And you expressed the thought of potential gaming. And is there any evidence that in the – I think about 14 years of the RSEP – well, 11 or 14, I don't remember which – has there ever been any evidence that that kind of thing has happened? And if we were to pursue this, I think we would have to go through that kind of analysis first and make sure that we're not just fighting ghosts, but we're fighting that indeed is a realistic threat given that we do have the public comments when the contract change is made as an opportunity to speak.

Any further thoughts on that? Cheryl, do you have anything as GNSO liaison? I'm not obliging you to speak, just asking you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Is that Seun trying to speak? I don't hear anything, so I'm assuming we have no comments at this point. Cheryl says, "Not from me." Alright. Anything else further before we go on again to dissect the next agenda item? I will assume not.

The next item is ALS status, and I'll turn it over to... Who is taking this one? That's Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Hi. Yes. Thanks so much, Alan. I'll be quick. If you've noticed on the agenda page, I updated it with a table that is the snapshot of all the

ALSes and ISOC chapters in different RALOs, and so we have an update of a total number of 228 ALSes in 101 countries. As of today, we just certified the ISOC Paraguay in the LACRALO region. We will be sending ARMIX, the Armenian Internet Traffic Exchange Foundation in APRALO to vote on the 31st of July. The regional feedback came back as positive to bring it to vote.

We are currently processing due diligence for one APRALO application and three AFRALO applications. And we also have two new members certified as individuals in the APRALO region, and we'll also be scheduling an upcoming NARALO orientation call for new ALSes and individuals sometime in September. That's all for me. Thanks so much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Evin. I'm partly on vacation – or in theory on vacation – even though I'm on this call. My recollection is ARMIX, we did receive the advice, we did start a vote and I halted it. Am I imagining that completely?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

No. That's correct but I will turn it over maybe to someone from APRALO to comment on the feedback, if they're online.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The reason we stopped it is there were a number of comments from ALAC members. The APRALO people said they had debated it and they were thoroughly convinced. I expressed my concern that although people may be convinced, it did still seem to be potentially a violation of

the rule that the organization must be controlled by end users, even though there were end users involved and they had consideration from it.

I do not believe we saw any closure on that, but maybe I missed some e-mails. Is there someone from APRALO who can comment? I don't mind reopening the vote, but I want to make sure that we've given all the information we need to ALAC members. Cheryl, you're the only APRALO person I see on the call at the moment. Do you have any [input to this]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Actually, Alan, I'm not. Kaili is on the call, and of course, Kaili is part of the leadership team where I am not.

ALAN GREENBERG: My apologies to Kaili. Unfortunately, I'm on a small screen and his name had rolled off the screen. So, anyone whose name starts after J, I don't see at the moment. So, my apologies to Kaili.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Kaili, do you have any insight into this?

KAILI KAN: No, not really. I don't recall we have reached any conclusion on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I think we're going to have to continue this on the mailing list. Olivier, I don't think we're accepting Internet exchange points unless the Internet exchange point was run by users, which is conceivable, but that is not what this organization is. Alright, I will send something out to the list and try to continue it. If necessary, we may have to continue this on the ALAC internal list, but I don't feel comfortable at this point that we have satisfied everyone who's on the call, every ALAC member. Now, Olivier is not an ALAC member, so Olivier doesn't need to be satisfied, but I do want to make sure that we have some level of comfort. Sébastien, go right ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien, I don't think we can hear you. At least I can't.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Is it better now? Can you hear me?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [inaudible] we cannot hear you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien, I can barely make out you saying, "Can you hear me?" But just barely.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Is it better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's probably good enough to hear. I'm not sure the interpreters can. But let's try.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, apologies. Let's just see if the interpreters can hear, because I can hardly hear Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible]

GISELLA GRUBER: The interpreters can't hear Sébastien, so if we do go ahead with it, we'll need a summary to be able to allow the people on the other language channels to hear what he's saying. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I can hear enough, I will give a summary. Sébastien, go right ahead. Try to keep it brief so I don't lose too much of it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I suggest that we postpone my speech? And we – I'll asked to be called [from my cell phone.] It should be better.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we'll wait a moment [inaudible]

GISELLA GRUBER: We have someone typing into –

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it's probably –

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, we have someone typing into a microphone that is causing disruptions. Please mute your microphones if you're not speaking. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I think that was Sébastien trying to type, which comes through better than voice. He's asked if he could be called on his mobile. Do we have the number?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, yes, we will do that now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see your comment, Olivier. Let's give him 30 seconds. If we can get him on, we'll do it. The agenda should allow the flexibility for this. Are we getting out to Sébastien, or should we go on in the agenda?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, we're dialing out to him.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, this is Seun.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am back. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you now, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Seun wanted to know if you can hear him also.

ALAN GREENBERG: I heard Seun briefly.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Yes, and sorry for that. I apologize. My Internet connection is not very good. Yes, I wanted to [inaudible] the question raised by Olivier. And the most general question is that, are we running a race to have more and more ALSes? And whoever our members, we take them because we think that it's one more? I think we need to – I will say – step back and talk about which type of organization we want, because I have the impression that part of the new members are even not participating.

Some of course are participating and that's great, but just number for number, it's not a good policy, I think. It's not to say that we are doing that, but sometimes I have the impression that we want maybe to compete with others in the GNSO or compete between regions to have a better number for our payroll at the end of the month. We are not paid? Oh, sorry. Then it's something we need really to think about, and it may be included in the reflection about the review. In one point, it seems totally contradictory to what the review wants us to do, and not for our good [elves] at At-Large. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. I think there are people who would support you with that. Anyone else has a comment on this particular item? I tend to agree with Sébastien –

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, Seun, I'll go to you a moment. I tend to agree with Sébastien that we have to really think about why are these organizations – why they want to become ICANN ALSes, not just why are they good organizations in their own rights for users. And I do have a [inaudible] Seun, go right ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yes, thank you. Yes, I kind of agree to what Sébastien [had said]. However, I want to just – I think Satish did promise to get back to us with some more details about this particular ALS application. I don't know whether he has done that. Maybe I missed it. I don't think I've seen it yet.

One thing I checked when I saw that application is I checked for [inaudible] I did not see any existing historical data of whether [inaudible] application in the past, or whether we had such ALSes in the past. I also have a feeling that there is probably a member or someone who is interested to be a member would just want to apply [inaudible]. If that is the case, maybe the [person] can consider individual membership if that option exists, and would give the same rights as the [person] is considered to use in [the applying as an] exchange point. But frankly speaking, exchange points controlled by end users, I have no idea what that means technically. Exchange points are not controlled by end users, technically. So, I don't see how they can fit in this kind of ALS [organizational] setting of ALAC. But I'd like to wait and hear more from Satish, because of course, any additional information [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Seun. Just two very quick comments. [IEXes] or rather Internet exchange points can be controlled by anyone who happens to run them and convinces people to join. The last interaction I recall with Satish is he said there are several members of this ALS candidate that were controlled by end users, and perhaps they would make good ALSes in their own right instead of the umbrella organization. And my response to that was, yes, if they indeed are end user organizations, then maybe they are eligible ALSes. But I don't think there was anything after that. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. I remember that there was an ALS in India. I had made a request for clarification to Satish, and he explained it very well. At that time, there was a very high number of organizations who were directly related to the end users. And I think that in this last case, this ALS is exactly the opposite case. That's why I agree that we should make a deeper analysis and get further information. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. And can I just check first that my audio is better for the interpreters?

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Cheryl, it's still very crackly, Cheryl. If you can just speak again. They did have a huge difficulty understanding [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll speak again, this time with the speaker off on my system. Is that better?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're still crackly, but you're understandable.

GISELLA GRUBER: For me, it's very [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's not much more I can do about it. I'm [practically muting] the phone.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll repeat what she says if they can't understand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] Okay. Let me remind you all of a couple of things, and just react to a couple. First of all – and sort of working in reverse order – at

least within the Asia Pacific Regional At-Large Organization, we have indeed got organization or [peak] bodies of end user organizations as At-Large structures. For example, ACANN, the Australian Communications Consumer Action Network is [peak] body. And I would defy that people like Holly Raiche from that organization would hardly be classified as uncontributory. So, the precedent is there.

Secondly, with our friends from Armenia, of all the countries where we have more than one At-Large structure already in place, let alone At-Large Structures hoping to be in place – to Sébastien’s and other points – I would argue we have a hugely successful and highly contributory group of people if I had to pick one country amongst many in the APAC region that punch well above their weight – to use a vernacular – it would be the Armenians. So, if indeed the regional advice is to support this as an At-Large Structure, I would suggest that you as the At-Large Advisory Committee consider it very seriously.

That said, it’s up to you, when you indeed get to the vote, to either accept or reject the regional advice. At this stage, the regional advice is yes, and you’ve asked for clarifications. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I will get back to Satish, and we will try to come to closure on this. The vote will restart when we have a level of satisfaction and not automatically on a specific date. Any further items on ALS issues? I do have one other question.

Olivier, I’ll see your hand up. I’ll come to you next.

The report that Evin pointed to has a column for ISOC chapters. Now, I know the At-Large Review Review Team was very concerned about ISOC chapters. I hadn't heard that as a general case before, and I'm not quite sure why we are highlighting it. Is anyone from staff in a position to explain why this was deemed to be important? Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. We started this kind of tracking when Rinalia started asking us to report back on a number of ALSes, which country and region they come from, and also indicate the ISOC chapters among the ALSes. So, it was started from Rinalia, and we just kept tracking these numbers. So, I guess it's because of [these have passed], so that the table continues to reflect that metric, but it's solely because of the request from Rinalia in the past. But if the community deems it not something worth tracking or could cause controversy, I think there wouldn't be a problem to take off this column.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. Thank you. I'll talk to Rinalia and find out what the background is. It would be useful by the way when we list number of countries or territories, if it is conceivably possible, knowing what the total number is would be interesting to know what percentage we have. Olivier, go right ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. And I was going to make the same comment as what you made regarding the ISOC chapters, which I did find a little

strange, especially if one looks at other organizations that are present in many countries. I'm not quite sure why we're not tracking these as well.

That said, the question I had was to do with decertification, and I asked in the chat whether the decertification workspace had been kept up to date. As a RALO Chair, I am particularly concerned to see that EURALO is still credited with 38 ALSes when we absolutely know that at least two of them have been suspended, and therefore all of our voting and so on is based on 36 At-Large Structures.

And looking again at the decertification workspace, I note that at least one of the two ALSes that EURALO is considering for decertification have actually a decertification needing to start as soon as possible. And it says, "After the Board election." I'm not quite sure what Board, and I recall that we've asked for this decertification to take place months and months ago, and nothing seems to be done on this, and I would like to find out where we are on this. And I note that there are a number of applications out there for decertification to take place, and I'm not sure whether these other organizations have been decertified in other RALOs. But I'm primarily concerned with EURALO, and I'm seeing things are not happening. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. There are a number of NARALO decertifications that are pending, and they were deferred until after the ICANN meeting just for workload issues, and they will be coming up very shortly. And I'll ask staff to make sure that if there are EURALO ones in the same condition that we do them all in the same batch. So, can I have an action item on

staff to identify whether there are any other ALSes other than NARALO that [need] decertification that are pending decertification. Any further items on ALSes?

If not, then we will go on to the next agenda item, that is reports. Are there any reports that need to be discussed verbally from either liaisons or any other parts of the organization? I see no hands. [Julie] says her web page is up, and Cheryl has her hand up. Go right ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Is my audio any better now? I've switched handsets.

ALAN GREENBERG: Your audio is beautiful now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we solved the problem then. Thank you. I just wanted to briefly raise one issue that I believe the ALAC may be interested in from the recent GNSO meeting. And the recent GNSO meeting was held earlier in our month than normal. It was held on – I think if I remember, it was the 13th of the month, the 13th of July. The reason for that was they needed to be able to have a second meeting or enough time should there have been a petition regarding the finance and strategic plan under the Empowered Community rules. That didn't come to pass, but they shuffled things around so that they could fit in an extra meeting if need be.

There were a number of things resolved, none of which will be terribly surprising to anybody, including selecting the current Chair, James, as the representative for the Empowered Community. But one of the things that I believe you'll be interested in that was deferred to our August meeting is in fact the matter of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet governance. Now, I've made sure that I've kept Olivier in very close and gory detail up to date on all of this, including the particular wording of a proposed resolution. We're talking about a two-pager here, so I'm not going to put it to this meeting.

But I just wanted to let you know that the decision on that resolution was deferred to our August meeting. It is intended to take a decision in the August meeting, and it is very likely that the resolution will go through, the motion will go through relatively unchanged from what it was presented. I just wanted to keep you [appraised] of that and let you know that I will keep Olivier, and obviously he'll keep the rest of the team regarding the Internet governance people up to speed on that. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. Can you give us a one-sentence summary of what the gist of or the intent of the motion is?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I can do my best. It's basically – apart from what [inaudible] support, going to the support to the extreme almost to make sure there is no way that people can assume there is a lack of support for the viability of the concept, the idea, and the importance of what happened in the

Cross-Community Working Group, but removing the GNSO support for the current Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance as the structure it currently is, waiting however for a new structure to be proposed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Support the concept, not supporting calling it a CCWG?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is absolutely against it being a CCWG, with a minority exception from a predictable part of the GNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I will point out that when we reapprove the new charter, we approve the new charter as a CCWG or as some other comparable structure. So, I think we've covered the ground either way.

Is there anything else, Cheryl? Your hand is still up. No? Then we go to Yrjö Lansipuro.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. My report of the GAC ALAC meeting at ICANN59 is on [inaudible] space. At that meeting, we discussed quite a lot on subsequent procedures, new gTLDs, and Mark Carwell from GAC is actually going to write something about the CBAs, the community based applications, and I have promised to keep in touch with him and see if together we could – ALAC and GAC – could actually say something

about the community-based applications or other categories, which is another item that seemed to be of mutual interest at our meeting. Any ideas on what the GAC and ALAC should be discussing in Abu Dhabi, please send me a note or put that on the mailing list. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. What I'd be delighted to do is to be able to report that we've actually been working together in some [secure] way on some subject. So, to the extent we can, we should not wait for Abu Dhabi for that.

Sorry. Let me go back to the agenda. Alright, there are no further comments on the report. Then we will go on to the next item, which is Item #7, and there is a document to display.

Item #7 is the issue of additional travelers to ICANN. You will recall that we got permission on a pilot basis for fiscal year 18 to send two additional people per ICANN meeting on the presumption that they were active in policy activities. That was the condition that we asked for. We also have one additional person since we were also funded – again on a fiscal year 18 basis only – for the GAC liaison. We have Maureen's slot which is not being used since she's funded as an ALAC member and so we have three slots to allocate.

I had asked for a small group to be put together made up of the Chair, either existing or ongoing Chair or incoming Chairs, and we have that group. I have sent them a proposal, and that is displayed in the Adobe chat room right now. We have about a week or so, maybe two weeks if we push it, to get the names in. So, we are on a rather tight schedule.

The proposal is basically echoing what the request was, and that is we're looking for volunteers who are actively involved in some ICANN policy activity, or those with a strong history of such involvement and plan to get reinvolved.

And by policy activities we mean GNSO or ccNSO PDPs, CCWGs, ALAC working groups of which we do not have any particularly active ones right now, but we do have a history in the past. I also believe that significant participants in the At-Large review, although not policy, are an essential part of the ICANN process under the Bylaws, and – in my mind anyway – qualify. And I would like to suggest that as the process for this go around at least, that we simply use the same group to review the applicants and make a decision on behalf of the ALAC. And I am looking for discussion on that and approval of the ALAC, if we can do that. I believe we currently have quorum at this meeting, so we can make a decision. Open the table, open the discussion.

Go right ahead, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Trying to get the [wrong hand off.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I am sorry. I didn't understand well your procedure. You said that you want this small group to decide on behalf of ALAC. Did you say that?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what I said. That is what I'm proposing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I don't think it is what I will accept. I would like this group to select to propose to ALAC, and ALAC decides, because ALAC is only [budget] to decide on such things. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. I will point out in the past I do not believe it has ever been an ALAC decision who has occupied extra travel slots. In general, when there are RALO travel slots, the decision is made by RALO leadership. On very rare occasions, they may have a vote, but usually it is RALO leadership, and on the cases where we have had ALAC slots, which are all relatively recent, they have all been either the Chair's decision or Chair in consultation with the ALT. So, I don't think it has ever been an ALAC decision as such.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with you, because it was a different thing. Now we have a new slot approved in the budget, so it is now a new ALAC request that has been accepted, and the ALAC has to decide on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I do not agree with that, but I'd like to hear from other people. We have a difference of opinion between two ALAC members. Is there a third ALAC member who would like to weigh in? Otherwise, Tijani and I will go into the wrestling ring.

Alberto, go right ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You have a queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alberto, go right ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: I agree with the fact that ALAC should decide on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. Took time to find my unmute button in my phone. Alan, I can understand your proposal and your point of view, but one thing I would like to urge you to not to multiply the body who make the decision on different things, on nominations for X, Y, Z, on travel for A, B, C, on speaking on E, D, F and so on. And I guess even if I understand you, I will support Tijani, because I think it's the best way to do for a lot of things.

And as you know, I will come back on this discussion about the selection for the NomCom people. And really, I think that at the end, it may be easier if there's one body – and it's ALAC – to make the decision. With all the input possible, but to decrease the complexity of the structure. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Sébastien, to be clear, Tijani was saying that this group should make a recommendation to ALAC, but ALAC ratify it. Are you supporting that, or saying ALAC makes the selection from the raw number of people?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, I have no problem with the selection committee, whatever [it does] the selection committee. I think [if] they make a proposal and then we ratify it, or we agree or disagree, but I agree with Tijani, to be sure. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there anyone else who would like to speak? If you're not speaking, we have three ALAC members who have said this. If you're not speaking, then you are agreeing [with them all] and disagreeing with me, just to be clear. Sébastien, is that a new hand?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, now we have four to express ourselves. You, myself, Sébastien and Alberto.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. There are three in one direction and one in the other. I think that's what I said. Alright, hearing no opposition, it will go to the ALAC for ratification. It will have to be a very quick ratification.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Javier said he agreed with me, so at this point we will do it with the ALAC since we don't have any time to debate it, but we will bring it up again since we now have a slight divided group. But we have a process going forward for this year. Thank you very much. That is a decision. Now, there's a motion in the chat, the decision is the ALAC – no, not the ALAC Selection Committee. The committee that is listed in this document that is the four Chairs, but the incoming Chair of the NARALO and the ALAC Chair will make a recommendation to the ALAC on who to fill the three slots.

Next item on the agenda is the ALAC review. And Cheryl, we did have an ALAC Working Party meeting earlier today, and I believe Cheryl will be giving a very brief summary of where we are and what the process is going forward. It's a very tight schedule. So, Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Yes, we held a working party meeting earlier today. And of course, ALAC are always welcome to the working party meeting.

We will be holding another one next week, so if you missed out on today, fear not. You may join us next week, probably around this time of day and towards the end of the week.

The reason we're doing that is we have a deadline, a very short deadline as Alan outlined, for our first stage as we prepare our assessment of the recommendations and the feasibility, and any implementation options that we see on each of those recommendations. To get it to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee for their September meeting means that we have to have it in front of you, the At-Large Advisory Committee in your August meeting, which means we need to have our deadline for input onto our document, which is on our wiki page, and the working document is also in Google Docs.

Ariel has kindly – someone has kindly, I suspect it's Ariel – put this up as an example on screen. You are all welcome to make comments on the wiki to this document. The document is a recommendation by recommendation pro forma template, and today's meeting we went through and looked at what is already populated in all of these pages, what needs to be done, and how one does do that.

And we'd ask that regional or individual information and comments on this work comes into the main document via the regional representatives of the review working party. Obviously, the At-Large Advisory Committee members, and the review working party members are welcome to make their comments directly on the Google Doc which is easy to find on the wiki page, but we will be accepting comments from absolutely anybody – preferably logged in so we know who you are – on the bottom of each of the wiki pages. And I think that's about

it. Alan, I don't need to go into any greater detail unless you believe we do.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. I'm not sure you said it, but if you did say it, I'll repeat it. If you didn't, I'll say it, that the deadline for the current set of comments is August 6th, Sunday, so you have through the end of the weekend of the coming week to make any comments. At that point, comments will be integrated into the document and there will be a second pass of comments, very short, and the almost finalized document will go to the ALAC at its monthly meeting next month for approval. There will still be a short period of time after that for cleaning up and grammar, and making sure the document is ready to ship. But that is the process going forward.

I don't think there are anything else. Based on our experience in the first At-Large Review, the implementation plan is going to be very generic and relatively barebones. There are lots of people with specific ideas of how to address issues and we will be looking at those in great detail as we proceed with the implementation, but it doesn't seem advisable to create a huge laundry list of things for the Board to tell us to do as opposed to us making sure we do it properly based on a relatively generic set of recommendations.

So please feel free to continue to contribute those details, but they'll not likely show up in the document but will be dealt with as we actually go on to the implementation, which we expect to track our recommendations to the Board pretty closely.

Any further, any comments from anyone on this? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we are ahead of time, I believe, at this point, just a little bit.

The next item is the NomCom delegates vote. There is a vote ongoing that finishes in about five hours, I think, or something less than that, three hours. There was a mistake made, which I know affected one ALAC member. I don't know if it affected anyone else. Because there were three different ballots, three different votes, they were combined into a single, BigPulse thing, and it turns out that the way it is configured, if you vote in any of them, you have to vote in all of them. And normally, we have the option for an ALAC member, for whatever reason they choose, to not participate. And that, I believe, did not happen. So that was an error.

If anyone intended to only vote in some parts of the process but not the others – and sorry, Ariel says it was now fixed, so the process has been rectified. If anyone has voted already and needs to change it because of that, then we can try to accommodate them but because this is a private ballot, a secret ballot, I'm not sure we can.

Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. I just checked BigPulse. In fact, all of the team ALAC members have voted and I did rectify the situation to allow that the ALAC member not to vote in certain poll, but to vote in the others.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I just want to make sure that if anyone else has a problem, that they make sure to voice their opinion. Only one person reported the problem. Other people may have experienced it. I don't know. That was not the intent by grouping them together. It was trying to make people's life simpler, not harder.

Anyone else? Sébastien, go right ahead. Cannot hear you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Okay, sorry, Alan. Thank you for giving me the floor.

Yeah, I think one of, I will say, from my point of view, a good practice would be to add a line with "I don't wish to participate" or "not participating" and that's a way to show that you are taking care of your vote, that you are not participating. It's a positive decision to [vote like that].

I know that in some parts of the world, they consider that abstaining is the same as not participating. In my type of understanding of democracy that I have, it's a big difference if I don't participate and if I abstain. If I abstain, I have no big... I don't want to choose one or the other. In not participating, you decide that you don't like the question or there is something different. Then maybe add this line in each vote could be a good way to do it.

My second point, and I know that you take care of this discussion, I want to raise it that the decision must be taken by ALAC members and as it is a decision of ALAC member, if anyone of the ALAC members propose a name, the name must be on the ballot. You can't ask, outside

of the vote, if people agree or disagree to have a name or another name. [And] it's a personal matter. It's not a good way to do it, to have the discussion outside of a vote. And I consider that if somebody, whoever it is, a member of ALAC, wants to add a name, whatever is his name, we need to add it in the ballot.

It's a question, from my point of view, of democracy. I understand that it wasn't the path you choose to take and ALAC choose to take, and I am disappointed with that. To be clear with everybody, it's why I didn't vote for the choice of the NARALO representative in the NomCom, not because I have no idea of agreement or disagreement. I know the two people. I could have vote, but I think for democratic purposes, I decided not to participate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I will comment on a number of things.

First of all, on the issue of abstaining, I understand that some bodies treat an abstention as a negative vote. That is not the case for ALAC. ALAC's explicit rules for deciding on how a ballot comes out is the number of yeses versus nos and there must be a certain number of non-abstaining votes to make sure we have a significant number of people participating or sufficient number of people participating, but we do not treat abstentions as a negative vote, except in a very few number of cases where the decision requires the positive voicing of a certain percentage of ALAC members.

The fundamental Bylaw is one of those, the Empowered Community. But that's very rare. Most of our votes are done purely on the yeses

versus nos or whatever the selection is, and abstentions do not count towards the negative count as they do in some processes, so just to be clear on that.

The concept that if someone mentions a name that it be added is nothing that we've ever done in ALAC and it certainly is something we could do going forward. We have treated the situation of NomCom recommendations where the RALO made a recommendation among several people, we have treated that differently over the years. It has ranged from doing the vote over, that the RALO did, over again in the ALAC to doing a subset of that to simply taking the recommendation of the RALO. And certainly, in the last previous case, that is exactly what we did and I simply followed the precedent.

When you raised the issue of "Should we do something else?" I went to the ALAC and said, "Do we follow the last precedent or do we do something else?" And there was a clear recommendation that we follow the last precedent.

So it's something we can certainly discuss again in the ALAC, but I believe I took action that was reasonable based on the history that we have right now. [Does] anyone else like to speak on this subject? Give people plenty of time.

No. Then we'll close the issue right now. Sébastien, if you wish to raise it on the ALAC in some future time, then feel to raise it as an agenda item. And it's a discussion we have. I would suggest it's more suited to a face-to-face discussion than a teleconference, but that could be your call.

ICANN59. Tijani, go ahead [inaudible] on previous subject.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Coming back to the question of Sébastien, I think that this is something that you can discuss because also, [inaudible] selection of the [fourth] elector is a decision of the ALAC members or At-Large members. And in this case, also, any At-Large member, working At-Large member, can submit a name and can be added to the slate in this case.

So since we have the roots for this election of the Board Director, we may have rules for other selections. And in this case, for the NomCom, we can have rules, we can have, how do you say, [inaudible] methods. We can have, more or less, a chapter for it so that we don't discuss it every time. We always do the same since we have it written. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't believe we've discussed it in many years. It has varied over the years, but I don't believe it's been discussed in many years. But if it needs to be discussed, as I said, anyone is free to recommend that it be put on the agenda, we can discuss it.

Olivier, go right ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan.

I recently heard in a Chatham House Rule meeting that there were requirements for people. People who are sitting on the NomCom should have some knowledge of how to select people and sort of how to read

good CVs, how to find the right people and so on, so some kind of skillset required.

Is there some skillset that we now look at or that the ALAC looks at when selecting the regional selections to be on the NomCom or is that not the case? Or is there going to be something to move this forward? Because one of the concerns has been, and I've heard some people say, "Well, this is seen as a good entry point for someone to get involved with At-Large whilst maybe we should have more effective people that have more knowledge about selection process and etc." Well, you were in the same meeting as me, anyway, so you know what I'm talking about. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. I actually don't remember what meeting it was, but I do remember hearing those words.

Look, over the years within At-Large, we have had different positions and different RALOs have taken different positions. If you look at the people other parts of ICANN normally send to the NomCom, very often, it is their most experienced people, or at least people with a large amount of history. Sometimes it's the only one who is willing to do it.

In At-Large, some RALOs have routinely used it as a good way to get involved in ICANN with people being put on the NomCom who knew nothing about ICANN and not necessarily having any experience in selection processes.

It's certainly a discussion that we can have. Again, I have made a statement a number of times saying I think we should be looking for experienced people. I certainly made that to the Review Team when they said, "We want new faces all the time," and the NomCom positions were included in those that they wanted to restrict in term limit, term limit from any positions.

So I tend to agree with you. Our RALOs have not always agreed with you and the ALAC has often also not agreed with you. So I think it's a discussion that's worth having. I'm not sure quite how we do that or how we enforce it, but I think it's a discussion worth having. It is, of course, yet another process discussion that we're supposed to not have any more of.

Any further comments? ICANN59, who is handling that? Heidi? Gisella?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi, Alan. So the first item is under... I just wanted to first stress the ICANN59 report. If you have not had a chance to read that, please do take a look at that. It has an excellent summary of all the ACSO activities including At-Large and I would suggest it's a very useful summary of what happened. Thanks to Ariel for preparing that.

And then the other, under 10A, we have ALAC matters. As we heard earlier, the action items are pretty much under control. So Alan, it's up to you if you want to go into anything else on that item. Otherwise, Tijani is ready to discuss the follow-up [at the] AFRALO General Assembly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no other things to raise right now, so we'll go to Tijani. Oliviér, is that a new hand or an old one?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A new one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead, then we'll go to Tijani.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. This is a question for Heidi on this post-ICANN59 Policy report. Is there going to be a post-ICANN59 Capacity Building or Outreach Report as well? Because this meeting is both a policy and outreach meeting, so I wonder whether there is also going to be the other part.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Oliviér. Did you mean 59 or do you mean working towards 60? Because the 59 report, again, that is the Policy Forum. Given that there was, there were activities in terms of outreach for AFRALO in particular, I believe there is an excellent summary within ICANN59 report on their outreach. Did you mean anything in addition?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much. So permit me to disagree with the notion that 59 is a policy meeting only. It's one of these things that started out as a policy and outreach. The reason being we are a smaller meeting that can, therefore, go to those places that we don't usually go to with the other two meetings which are of a larger size. At least, that's what I had heard in the actual report of the meeting strategy and I'm sure Sebastián will be able to say a couple of words about this.

But I'm particularly worried – not even concerned now, but worried – that we are more and more taking away the outreach part and going into this policy part. There have been some significant work done on outreach at this meeting and I don't understand why we're kind of hiding this. Is there something dirty about outreach? Or I'm not sure.

I'm being a bit provocative here because I'm seeing this policy thing go more and more into, "This is just going to be a policy report and policy meeting, and we're not even going to do outreach in the future." Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastián, briefly. We started off ahead of schedule. We're now behind schedule. Sebastián, I can't hear you.

SEBASTIÉN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. No, thank you, Alan. That's I mute my phone.

Yeah, I would support what Oliviér said, and I guess the fact that the name given to this meeting, it's a policy meeting, it's now that we forget

that one day was supposed to be to organize by each and every community, some outreach in the place we are going.

In the same time, Oliviér, the fact that we went again in South Africa shows that we less care about the outreach because we were supposed to go for what was called B meeting at that time in a smaller country, a smaller place to go. But it seems that now, in Africa, we have just the choice between one of the towns in South Africa and one of the towns in Morocco and nothing else. And then outreach will be short to be done.

But I agree with you that it's a very good question and if we have a report from the meeting, we need to have both, a report about outreach and policy as it was supposed to be both of those items in [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. My recollection is the first B meeting ended up, for reasons we all understand, in Helsinki, and since there was no opportunity for outreach there, we called it a policy meeting and the name now has more relevance than the intent of the meeting. But so be it.

Heidi, if we could please proceed with ICANN59 report and Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. I'd like to update you about the APRALO activities in Johannesburg.

Going back to the issue that Oliv er raised and Sebasti n commented on, this is something that we said from the beginning and we repeated several times. We repeat it to everyone, but nobody wants to hear. Nobody wants to listen to us.

We said that the Meeting Strategy Working Group who worked during, I don't know how long, and with a lot of energy and time spent on it, decided that [inaudible] is only thing for outreach and CROP work for each community. This was the definition of Meeting B.

Now because we have the [inaudible] policy forum, without the agreement of the community and even without informing the community, they decided and they implemented. It is like this. And I don't know who decided in this case. I don't know why we do it, so what is the philosophy behind it? We always say that ICANN is the [inaudible] process, but even in something which is directly related to the community [inaudible] is not [relayed] by the community, unfortunately.

I stop here and turn back to the APRALO activities in Johannesburg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Please, Tijani. We really do need to move on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. I will start by capacity building and outreach. We did several activities in this field. First of all, we [inaudible] in a local community engagement session during the morning of Monday and it was, in my point of view, a very successful session. We managed to bring about 16

students and teachers from the [inaudible] university and we, first of all, presented more or less ICANN and Internet very briefly and then we gave them the floor to give us their concerns, their point of view, etc. And I think it was a very good thing.

We did that in Marrakech, but we want to do this in Marrakech and [inaudible] on that, it is very adventurous to go outside the camp of our venue so we brought them to our table.

The second capacity build activity was an capacity building session for the ALSes, and there were four capacity building sessions about policy topics, not about the process, not about the definition of ICANN, of constituencies, etc. No, we did that remotely before the meeting by webinars and in Johannesburg, we did four sessions, face-to-face sessions, about the policy subjects.

Also, we organized our showcase, as you know, so I will not say anything about it. It is something that everyone knows, and one of the main parts of our activities in Johannesburg was the General Assembly. We organized our General Assembly, but unfortunately time was very, very short for it because we had a lot of things to discuss.

The main thing that took our time was the review of our operating principle. Unfortunately, [inaudible] we didn't have time to discuss [anything], we really didn't decide on anything about this review and we turned back, when we finished the meeting, we raised again the issue of the [individual] membership. And now we are voting on [individual] membership in LACRALO and it will pass because before that, we did a [conference] call and the [conference] call was almost [inaudible] about

accepting it. So it will be only a fourth [inaudible] that we are doing now [inaudible] individual membership.

Another thing that I want to brief you about is the hot topics for AFRALO. In our last session, it was the wrap-up session, we addressed the hot topics for AFRALO.

First of all, we asked EURALO and ALAC to give us their experience since EURALO did the work on that, and since also in ALAC, we did something like this. And that [inaudible] update, we started to identify the hot topics and now we have a list. And we are going to continue working on it because it was only a brainstorming there, but we will start official sessions, discussing the hot topics and finalizing them so we will have our document about hot topics for AFRALO.

I will stop here. I know you are running out of time. Thank you very much. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right, now I was on mute. Anyone with any questions or comments to Tijani?

Certainly, I was impressed by the amount of work you did and the focus that an awful lot of the people had in the group. I think it was quite impressive.

Then we will finish, go on to this item. The next item is ICANN60. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you. I will make this very brief.

So we have about three months before ICANN60, the annual general meeting for – we already have the workspace set up. That is linked to your agenda.

For Item 11A, initial themes and topics. Perhaps it would be a useful suggestion to create a wiki page on that ICANN60 Abu Dhabi meeting, which is the At-Large workspace to allow people to add suggestions for themes and topics.

Alan, is that okay to make that an action item?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay, perfect. Thank you very much. Ariel, if you could please note that.

And then also, just if we could discuss the ALAC development session. Again, that is for continuing and incoming ALAC members and liaisons that is going to take place on the final day, Friday of ICANN60. In the past, we've had a couple of different types of formats and this year, after talking to our training in the HR department for several years, they are now possibly able to facilitate or moderate that ALAC development session, so I'm just wondering if there is any support of exploring that possibility to have an internal staff, but expert moderator or facilitator for that session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, I guess I'd like to hear some proposals from them of what kind of activities or what kind of session they either are imagining or they can help with. Just the presence of a facilitator or not does not really give us a good idea of what we're talking about, so perhaps we can get a little bit more detail.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sure. I'm happy to do that. The other option is that we offer some ideas on what some of the needs of the ALAC development session might be given the current or the ongoing makeup of the ALAC and then see what they would suggest in terms of what they might be able to contribute.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, I think we would welcome input on any of those issues from anyone who has been involved in these sessions in the past. We will also be having a development session for RALO sessions. So it's a separate session, but in parallel, so that also is a similar situation.

I don't see any hands right now, but I guess we need to keep on bringing it up and maybe an e-mail to the ALAC list. I would use the full ALAC list to get comments from other people as to what might be useful, either based on people's past experience that they felt when they were coming onto the ALAC or people who simply have that kind of experience in other parts of their lives. So let's raise the issue there and see if we get anyone to bite.

Heidi, I'll ask you if you can do that, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sure. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Cheryl said, of course, she's happy to help with any development sessions as she has in the past.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I was counting on that.

Alan, so the next item is fee and if, I'm not sure if Maureen is on the call to talk a little bit about plans for APRALO, their GA.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen is not on the call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, if not, Gisella, I'm wondering if you could... or Cheryl, could just very briefly talk a little bit about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl has her hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Thank you, Heidi.

I'm happy to step in very briefly and let you know that the General Assembly plans for ICANN60 from APRALO are progressing. We've had a division into a number of work tracks including the specific agenda, etc. and activities for our General Assembly.

It is early though, as yet, but all of those work tracks are underway, and most importantly, one of the more difficult ones, which is often the case, the one of funding our activities is already, I would suggest, well underway with some of our normal funding requirements already being met. But we are still looking for a couple of sponsors that, I think, at this early stage, I'm personally very pleased with the progress.

And just to let you all know why Maureen and others from APAC are not here today, today is the first of our AP Regional IGF days so people are either on the ground in Bangkok or are traveling to it for the main opening day tomorrow with the [inaudible] IGF [on] running today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Are there any further comments on the issue of the APRALO General Assembly?

Then that agenda item is complete and last call for Any Other Business.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, Alan, I have – I had mentioned – for Any Other Business.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, go right ahead and then we have Oliviér.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So I want to note we have provisionally chosen our two global indigenous Fellows. We had a tough competition and we have chosen our ambassadors. Well, they've been informed but we are still waiting for them to get, go through the old [fax] screenings from ICANN. But we have some very good people, one from Bolivia and one from the U.S. and we had and want to thank our Evaluation Committee, which was composed of people – Sarah Kiden from AFRALO, Vanessa Aquino Ribeiro from LACRALO, myself and [Glenn] and [inaudible] and Eduardo from NARALO, and Maureen from APRALO who all looked through a lot of applications.

Right now, we are going to open up the application for the mentor to accompany the indigenous Fellow and then we'll be done. But I just wanted to announce that to the group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Judith. Sounds good. Oliviér?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan.

I was going to ask you about one of the main processes which is taking place this weekend, this weekend, sorry this summer – not even this weekend, this summer – in which I haven't seen any update on that's

the GDPR discussions that have taken place both at ICANN, but with a process that was supposed to take place this summer.

I've seen in my mailbox a gTLD registration date of flow matrix and information update and have noticed that the ALAC has participated in this by furnishing some responses as well as many others. Does anyone have any update on this, please?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't know who has received that. I received it, I believe, late last night and I was going to be forwarding it to the ALAC. I haven't had a chance yet. I believe there is also a blog entry that was posted today that will update it. I haven't had a chance to look at it, I'm afraid. I'm busy with most other things most of the day other than other calls. But I will be sending it out later on this evening.

So I have no output other than I know the intent of ICANN is to try to put together a proposal to run by the privacy commissioners sometime in the September/October timeframe this year. I cannot tell you anymore about it other than that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, Alan. It's just that the blog entry, the thing says that, you know, they had end users were involved with this and I wasn't quite sure who in At-Large in the ALAC was.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was me and I did send something out to the ALAC asking for further comments on what I had done as an initial cut and I received none. I received some comments from Holly but not substance changes to the document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is still opportunity. It's now out for public comment, so if you see other end user-related things, and I include user registrants and end users, that I missed, then please. I did that very, very quickly as you would expect, as you might expect, and I did look for other input from the ALAC but didn't receive any. But there's still an opportunity if you know things that I've missed. So I encourage everyone to look at it.

Any further comments?

Then I thank you all for your attention and the meeting is adjourned.
Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call and please don't forget to disconnect your audio. Enjoy the rest of your morning, evening, or afternoon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]