
EVIN ERDOŽDU: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone, and welcome to the ALAC monthly teleconference on Tuesday 22nd August, 2017 from 4:00 UTC to 6:00 UTC.

Today on the call with us we have Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Sarah Kiden, Javier Rua-Jovet, Kaili Kan, Sébastien Bachollet –

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Evin or have I been dropped?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're not dropped, I can hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: We seem to have lost her.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, you haven't dropped. Gisella, are you able to continue, or can you give us an update?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes.

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.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Apologies for that. I dropped from the line, but I am back now. So, let me continue with the roll call. Andrei Kolesnikov, Bastiaan Goslings has just joined us, Yrjö Lansipuro, Bram Fudzulani, Satish Babu and Ricardo Holmquist.

On the Spanish channel, we have Maritza Agüero, Harold Arcos and León Sanchez. On the French channel, we have Gabriel Bombambo, Abdeljalil Bachar Bong.

We have listed apologies from Justine Chew, Marita Moll, Ali Almeshal, and Aziz Hilali.

On staff, we have with us Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Ariel Liang, Yesim Nazlar and myself, Evin Erdoğan. I'll also be doing call management.

Our interpreters today are Veronica and Marina on the Spanish channel, Jacques and Claire on the French channel and Galina and Maya on the Russian channel.

I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name for the record and also for transcription purposes. And with that, I'll turn it over to you, Alan. Please begin.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Evin. This is Alan Greenberg, Chair of the ALAC. Just for the record, I'm having some problems with the phone, and if I drop out, I may drop out somewhere along the way and have to redial on another line. So if that happens, don't be too surprised.

Are there any questions, comments about the agenda or Any Other Business to add to it?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Seun is there on the call as well. I didn't hear my name. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Seun, noted. You are recorded in the agenda as being bold, which means you're here. So, we will make sure you are in the attendance list. Any comments, questions on the agenda? If not, go ahead, Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. Could you put one minute on the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance update on there?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Done, under Any Other Business. Anything else? Seeing nothing, we'll assume the agenda is adopted as presented with the addition of a CCWG Internet Governance under Any Other Business.

There is very one substantive item on the agenda today, and that is the At-Large Review feasibility study. We have 60 minutes allocated to that. If that goes a lot quicker, this may be a very short meeting. But let's wait and see. I've learned not to predict that now.

We have the first standing item is review of outstanding action items. Heidi has given zero minutes for that, so I'm assuming there is nothing that requires the attention of the ALAC. The first substantive item therefore is ALAC policy development issues.

It's pretty weak – not weak, it's pretty low-key right now with only two issues showing up on it, and in both cases, I've asked people to take a look at the item during the last ALT meeting. I asked people to take a look at the item, and perhaps we can have some feedback at this point.

The first one is the organizational review of the ASO, the Address Supporting Organization. It is being done by some of the same people who did our review, so it's of mild interest to us.

Normally, we don't comment on these kind of things unless we feel there is something that particularly needs our input or we feel is quite inappropriate. And I think Cheryl said she would look at it, but I may have that wrong. But I know somebody said they would look at it. Is it Cheryl or somebody else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is Cheryl, and no, she hasn't for a number of reasons.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Is there anyone on the call who has looked at this and wants to offer any input? The deadline is at September 6th, so it's coming up on us in a few weeks. We have a little bit of time if something comes up, so let's put that one on hold right now and we'll go back to it on the mailing list if indeed there is anything that's pressing.

The next item is a statistical analysis of DNS abuse in gTLDs. This is a report that was done for the CCT Review Team. It is quite a substantive paper. I think heavy is the word that could apply. A significant part of the paper is talking about their methodology and the kind of data they were looking at, and I believe Olivier said he would take a look at it, and perhaps ask other people in EURALO. Olivier, have you had a chance? Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I have not had a chance to read it myself. I have asked other people and they said they will come back to me. But they didn't, so let's put this on my card and I'll work on this later on today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Thank you very much. So, we have an action item for Olivier to get back to us moderately quickly. Yes, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. There is a public comment just published at 23:59 UTC yesterday, so it was not included in the agenda, but I just want to bring this to everyone’s attention. It’s the proposed date for ICANN public meetings 2021 to 2023, and I will put the link in the chat. And I’ve just created the –

ALAN GREENBERG: What is the deadline on that one?

ARIEL LIANG: That’s October 2nd. So, we have plenty of time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. That should be of some interest to people. We’ve had a number of complaints and comments from within At-Large about how our ICANN meetings do not take into account people’s holidays and other meetings that are being held. So, please take a look at that.

If you have any comment, then certainly this one in particular, I think there’s no reason that everyone cannot individually in their own name put a comment in. However, if anyone sees something that they believe really warrants a consolidated ALAC comment, then please speak up and we’ll take a look at that.

Any further comments on policy and public comments? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we’ll go to the next item, which is the review of current ALS and member applications. Evin, are you handling this?

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Yes. Hi. Thanks, Alan. I'll just be very brief. We have a decertification vote closing next week, at which time we'll be decertifying four ALSes, so our total number of ALSes would be 224 in 100 countries.

On the agenda page, there is the table, a snapshot of each RALO. But we do have quite a few applications in the pipeline for due diligence, most coming from the AFRALO region, and we're thinking that's probably due to the recent ICANN59 meeting, so that's great news.

We are also currently voting on ARMIX this week, which will close I believe on Wednesday, and we're recently certifying a new individual member from NARALO, a Thomas Struett. And we'll also be sending out a Doodle for the NARALO orientation call which should be held on the first week or so of September. That's all from me. Thanks so much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Evin. A couple of comments on that. Number one, the decertification votes, there are four in this one. We have been given notice from at least one RALO – and I suspect more – that there are other decertification votes that are in the pipeline and will be coming to us very soon.

If there are other RALOs that believe there are decertifications that should be done, this would be a good time to make sure that the documentation is up to date so we can present them all at once.

Yes, Olivier, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Please put me in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will do that. Olivier and then Ariel.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I am very pleased with the level of detail that we have in this report of the ALSes that are coming and ALSes that are leaving.

The thing that raises my [authority], the recently certified individual members. As you know, in Europe we have an Individual Members Association for this. How does one let staff know of progress on individual members? Is this something that we need to notify them of? Or how does it work?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can answer that. In some of the RALOs, staff is involved in the process. So for instance in NARALO, you become an individual member by sending specific information in an e-mail to staff, so they implicitly know.

Within EURALO, because of how it's structured, there is no involvement of staff. So, we can either keep silent on it if that is what you wish, and perhaps due to privacy reasons or the lack of asking whether we can publicize it you may want to do that, but on the other hand if you feel

you would like to let us know and make this public, then that's something we can do.

The discussion the ALAC has to have sometime in the future is just as we make ALS membership a matter of public knowledge, do we want to do that officially with individual members? We never had that discussion, so it's one we certainly should have. But that's the answer at this point. Right now, staff knows if they are involved in the process, and they are in some RALOs but not in all.

Next, we had Ariel. Was that an old hand? I see it's put down now. Did you want to speak, or not?

ARIEL LIANG: Old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Tiajni, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Evin, what is the difference between the Application #275 and 274?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Good question, Tijani. Thanks so much. I followed up with Nathalie just to confirm if they were the same organization, because actually, they have two different names, slightly different although very similar. But

the contacts listed are different and they're also in different cities in Mauritius.

It looks like they're two separate organizations, but we're going to confirm with them that that's the case and they didn't just reregister randomly. But for now, that is correct.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you. Please try to make the different... to be sure that they are two different organizations, because I suspect that it is a mistake. I don't know where. We cannot have two organizations with exactly the same name. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

More interesting would be living in Mauritius with two groups saying that they're responsible for the Internet Governance Forum.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG:

But that's their problem, not ours. Anything else on ALSes? Then we will proceed to the next item, which is reports. Normally reports are filed electronically, but if anyone has reports either – typically liaisons, but if any of the other groups that file reports want to bring anything to our attention, this is a good time. Is there anyone who would like to do that?

“Nothing from me,” says Maureen. We have a question from Krishna Seeburn, or a comment, who does not file reports, but if there is nothing from any of the regular people, then we’ll go to Krishna. Seeing no one else raise their hands or call out, Krishna, you’re on. Krishna? If Krishna is speaking, we cannot hear him.

KRISHNA SEEBURN: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can, yes.

KRISHNA SEEBURN: Okay. I just want to go back to the two organizations that was mentioned before. I suspect you’re talking about two ISOC chapters, yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we’re talking about two groups that are called – one on our records is called Mauritius Internet Governance Forum and the other one is called Internet Governance Forum Mauritius.

KRISHNA SEEBURN: Yes. Oh, these two. It’s not a mistake. There are two groups actually trying to do that. One is coming from the government and the second is actually coming from the private – well, individual side of people. So, it’s

not quite a mistake, but I suspect the thing that needs to be done is to get them to work together. That's the point I wanted to make.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Krishna. Certainly, it's not up to us to get them to work together, but I will note that if indeed you're correct and one of them is basically largely government, then they're not an appropriate ALS anyway. So, I think we need to do some work on this. But thank you for your intervention.

KRISHNA SEEBURN: Yes. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Krishna is from Mauritius, so he probably has some idea of what's going on there.

KRISHNA SEEBURN: Yes. There's always this problem happening, so one's trying to do it from one end and the other was doing it from the other end. Basically, this is something that needs to be sorted out. Yes, that's true.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps they should pick different names.

KRISHNA SEEBURN: Yes, I guess so. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Back on to the reports, we didn't have anyone calling out, so unless I hear something, we'll go on to the next substantive item which is a substantive item, and that is the At-Large review, final discussion on the review and the discussion on the feasibility assessment, and hopefully a decision on the feasibility assessment.

Can we have the presentation, please? No, that's the feasibility study. There's a much shorter presentation. That's the one. And Evin, if you could take control of the slides, and I'll tell you when to go on to each one. Next slide, please.

This presentation is linked in the agenda if anyone wants to pull up a private copy. Okay, the process going forward – and we'll talk a little bit about this at the end of the discussion also – is we're now at the stage where we have what we believe is a pretty complete – we certainly hope it is a pretty complete – set of comments from the ALAC and the At-Large Working Party to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board. This essentially says what we think of each of the recommendations and what do we plan to do about it.

Once we get approval – and the approval is being done now because it's really something which has to be done with discussion of the ALAC, not just a silent vote afterwards. It's really important that we have everyone behind this and everyone understands what it is we're doing.

We still have a little bit of final cleanup to do. It's largely cosmetic. There may well be some grammar changes and some things that are

fixed to clarify, but the intent is that we not make any substantive changes at this point.

The document will then be submitted to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. It will review it relatively soon afterwards, within the, I think early October timeframe. We expect it to go to the Board soon after that, and at that point once – assuming the OEC and the Board approve it, they could always bounce it back to us – we’re hoping the model that was used for the GNSO will be followed and indeed the report will be approved and will come back to us for implementation.

Now, that’s the overall plan. We would hope by the time we get to the next ICANN meeting in Abu Dhabi, we either have approval from the Board or it will be approved then. I’m not quite sure what the timing is, but at some level despite everything we’ve put into the process up until now, at that point the work begins. Next slide, please.

So, what we’re going to do right now is a quick overview of the recommendations. I hope everyone will be slightly bored because you know it all, but I think it’s really important that we say some of the words and that everyone understand what we’re going to be doing. Next slide, please.

We want to look at it from two different aspects, two different directions. One, does the comment, does our response reflect consensus of At-Large?

That doesn't mean everyone agrees. We're always going to have some people on any given issue who may not agree, although in this case I think we have close to unanimity if not close.

And the second thing is, what are we committing to, and is it practical and implementable? Because it's really important not to simply say we're going to do all sorts of things, and then find out when it comes time to actually do them that, "Oops, this is not going to be really easy. It's going to take a lot more time than we're predicting, or a lot more effort, or perhaps it's not even doable given the resources we have." So, it's really important that we look at it from that perspective. Next slide.

And we're right into the recommendations at this point. Recommendation 1 was – and these are very shorthand versions of both the recommendation and our answer, so I apologize if I haven't captured it in its fullest. But we're trying to keep this brief, and again, I think everyone has looked at these at least to some extent over the last long number of months.

So the first one is, be selective on advice. We're saying yes, we support this, but we already do it. But we do note that the web and the wiki did not reflect it.

It's not particularly surprising that the reviewers did not quite understand how selective we are, because for instance if you go to the web, in certain places it says everything is policy advice, even though I think we've actually advised the Board two or three times in the last year or two. But if you go to certain parts of the web, everything is called advice.

And in fact, right now if you go to the Board advice register, it also says everything is advice. That's a problem for a separate reason that we're trying to clear up. And I'll take questions as we go along if anyone has any, or we can hold them to the end as you wish. I'll pause for a moment in case anyone has a comment. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. And sorry to come with some story, but I was thinking about that, and I am a little bit uncomfortable. The first thing is that it is not just [this] recommendation. Personally, I would like to say that I did agree with the recommendation because we are doing it, but it seems that the group has decided that they want to be more positive, and I would have been more negative because I think all this report was bad work and we lose a lot of time.

But my second point might be more a question, is that we have to be very careful on what we say we are supposed to be as At-Large Advisory Committee to the Board. And if at the end we say, "Oh, guys, we just issue five advices to Board," one could ask us what we are for if we spend all this money just for five advice.

I am not sure how we can write that and answer at the same time what is the purpose of this recommendation, and at the same time not to be in a trap about what we are supposed to do at the end of the day to be an advice group to the Board.

I know that we are doing a lot of other things, but the first thing we are is At-Large Advisory Committee to the Board. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sébastien. I'll be honest, I don't have that problem. Whether we should have said, "Yes, we support it but we're doing it already," or "We reject it because we're doing it already," that I think is a valid point. And yes, we were trying to be more positive. I don't think it makes much difference, because they have the same end result, but one could look at that question.

On the question of being criticized because we don't submit much advice to the Board, we do cover that in the detailed response in the feasibility study. And in particular, we say that we believe it is far more productive to participate in the development of policy to respond to the public comments and not wait to give advice to the Board as for instance the GAC used to do in a hopefully bygone day.

That to give advice to the Board at a time when they cannot do a lot about it, or if they can, it's going to be really difficult. I think that is a misuse of our resources. And if we can focus all of our attention so by the time something gets to the Board it doesn't need our comments, I think we're doing our job much better. And I think that's a defensible position. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, Alan. I got your point, and I think it's a good one, but that means that at the end of the day, we are not really anymore a body advising the Board. We are much more than that, and maybe at the end of all this, [via] sort of our group, how we can rename or refocus, or whatever

you want to say, Alan, but it may be a task we need to handle after we are finished with it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I guess I don't worry about the name. And as an Advisory Committee, we do have the escape hatch of if we are not being listened to [set] to our reasonable belief, then we can provide advice. And we do on a semi-regular basis, just not on a monthly basis or on a quarterly basis. Anyone else have any comments on this one? Then go on to the next slide, please.

All right. Recommendation #2 is the recommendation on the Empowered Membership Model. We reject the recommendation, but with a number of caveats. And in the actual feasibility study, some of these are mentioned under recommendation two, some are mentioned under the specific EMM recommendations. For the purposes of this presentation, they are all grouped together.

Those caveats are important. Despite the fact we're rejecting the model, we accept the need to increase focus on individual members. And as you're aware, we up until recently had three RALOs that supported individual members. We now will have – hopefully in the next month or so – AFRALO that will add that, and LACRALO is in the process of doing it. So, we are well along our way to fulfilling that commitment.

But we also must focus on the members of ALSes. We have claimed in our response that we do not believe we should completely defocus our attention on ALSes, but ALSes are groups of people, and it's really

important that we try to reach those people and not just the formal representatives. And that's something we're going to be starting to do that I think is going to be an increased focus as we go forward, because if indeed we are successful, we then have another interesting issue of we now have multiple people from a single ALS who are active, and how do we handle that? It's not something we're well geared up to handle right now.

We reject the merger of the ALAC regional leaders and liaisons and the implicit freeing up of travel slots. We do not believe that that would make good use of people, nor would we serve their individual responsibilities well.

We accept the need to have increased opportunity for travel for active policy workers, and we already are in a position where we have two people who are funded for this fiscal year on a pilot project. And in fact, we also had a few other slots for this particular upcoming meeting that we filled, and we also were able to fill them with people who were pretty active in policy activities. So, I think we're making good headway in actually implementing that one also.

The review put a large amount of stress on uniform individual member rules across all RALOs, and we say that that may be a target that we should look at some time in the future, but it's not our priority right now. Our priority is to have active individual members, not necessarily have uniform rules.

We do not accept the Council of Elders that they prescribed, which had an awful lot of very specific rules. One of the problems certainly that I

found in this overall review is instead of making global recommendations, they gave detailed implementations of exactly how do you staff this and exactly what rules do you use. And in many cases, the concept was fine, the details were not. And this is one of those that we accept that we may want to do something to recognize and make use of former active members, but not as they're indicating it there.

And lastly, we reject the concept of appointing leaders and other positions using random selection, which they were advocating in a variety of different places.

Questions, comments. This is going to be one of the interesting ones in that even though we're rejecting the recommendation, we are committing to do a lot of work. And to some extent, the success of the review is going to be a make or break on how well do we fulfill some of these commitments. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. I think that you forgot that the advice that our liaisons will be selected by the NomCom, and this is something that we reject.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I didn't forget it. That was part of the merger of ALAC and liaisons, just like it was merger of ALAC and regional leaders. I didn't specify all the details here, but that is included in the third bullet. They were saying essentially the 15 ALAC members are all of the officers, leaders, whatever in all of At-Large, and that is what we are rejecting.

Tijani, go ahead, you still have your hand up. No. Any other comments? Then we'll move on to the next slide, please.

Recommendation 3 is staff should more actively support policy activities in relation to administrative activities. We support in principle – that is we welcome and we will be having staff more involved in some policy activities, but we reject the thesis that currently, they are not portioning their time properly.

Although we believe there are needs for increases of staff involved in policy issues, and particularly with regard to communication with individual members and ALS members, we also feel that there are lacks and holes in our administrative support that we have not had enough ongoing support on. Not due to people slacking off, but just not having enough staff to cover all of these issues.

So, we believe we must make progress on both sides and therefore reject the fact that the balance was the only issue. Comments, questions? Next slide, please, then.

Recommendation 4, dissolve the ALT and return decision making to the ALAC. We're rejecting that in that the ALT does not make decisions and it's just an advisory body. And that is not only what our Rules of Procedure say, but in fact how it is carried out.

I will assume there are no comments, questions on that one, but I'll wait a second just in case, see if we can go on to the next slide. Oh, Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Alan. Yes, I have no problem with this recommendation, but I think – I don't know how to say it, but you need to think about what's really the ALT. I have the impressions at some time it's overdoing, and [let's] get back to ALAC sometimes. I have no specifics for that, I'm sorry, but it's a feeling I have since a long time. I am not asking you to change something here in the recommendation, but as you [went on] to a new ALT with a lot of new people, maybe it will be time to think about that, and maybe it could be done with the full ALAC to think how we can organize it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. As you say, we'll have a largely new group of people other than me, and if people feel that – people who were not on the ALT before and go there and find suddenly that there are things that they believe should have been brought to the ALAC, that's going to be a great opportunity to change what we do. So, I'm quite open to that. Next slide.

Redouble efforts to join meetings between ICANN senior staff and I* leaders. Our response is pretty easy on that, that we don't get invited. If we are invited, we will attend. And that notwithstanding, we have lots of activities on an operational level with pretty much all of the groups. And we have various memorandums of understanding or other operational situations where there's lots of interaction.

It varies from RALO to RALO depending on which groups are active within each RALO, but I think that's a simple answer. And of course, there also are funding implications. We'd be delighted to go to more

meetings. IT would be nice if we didn't have to pay for it ourselves. Comments, questions? Seeing none, next slide, please.

Simplify At-Large director selection process. We are rejecting that. The current process for any of its good or bad points was developed through a bottom-up process. It has changed slightly over the last number of years. It may well change again. It may well change in a substantive way if there's enough will to do it, but it's not the Board's business to tell us how we select the Board members. Presuming there is no evidence of capture and the Board member actually being selected by something other than At-Large. I'm presuming no comments on this one, and go on to the next, please.

Abolish all working group – no, don't skip 7. It's a really nice recommendation. Go back to 7, please. Abolish all working groups. No. That's our answer. However, there is a – sorry. Okay. Evin is saying there's a lag in the Adobe Connect room. Sadly, we have lags in a lot of places.

Although we're rejecting the recommendation, it did cause certainly me and others to take a look at what we have on the web and wikis for representing our working groups, and to be quite honest, it needs a lot of work.

It is exceedingly difficult for someone to enter At-Large and see where it is they might be able to help, because they're presented with a lot of information which is not only not necessarily up to date, but also is misleading in a number of places.

And I've already initiated a project with Heidi and Evin to start updating the web and the wiki to be more useful to people and to make sure it's accurate and up to date, so again, a recommendation where we categorically reject it, but it is causing some work to be done, which I hope will make us in a better position to represent ourselves to the rest of the world.

Recommendation 8, please. Next slide. Use social media more effectively to engage and pull users. We support the intent, but we do have concerns with accessibility because of regions where – either for bandwidth or legal reasons – not all tools and social media networks are available and accessible to people. And because of that lack of accessibility, the representativeness of feedback is not necessarily something that is actionable. But nevertheless, we agree that it's something that is interesting and we should look at, taking the cautions and the caveats fully under consideration. Not seeing any comments, and Heidi is pointing at the Social Media Working Group is active in this and will continue to be active in this.

Recommendation 9, please. Designate staff as web community manager to coordinate – and the recommendation does say to coordinate among other things social media outreach. I have great deal of lack of understanding why they felt it was necessary to give us the name of a title of someone for a part-time job, but again, it's an interesting report.

We support the intent. We believe there is already someone with a different title who is in place who is supporting our web and social media activities. It is not our job to name new people into positions, but all of that being said, we support the intent and we hope that will be

done. Comments, questions? All right, Recommendation 10, please. We are over half over.

Use new communication tools – and they refer to them as Slack-like tools . We support with reservations. We have a diverse community and diverse requirements and limitations. Those limitations include bandwidth and accessibly expensive bandwidth. They also include connectivity, which is not particularly reliable in some places at some times.

We also note that we generally cannot adopt tools, unless they're really publicly supported, without the support of ICANN IT and their commitment to provide the appropriate resources to manage them if that's applicable. And that's why we have a Technology Taskforce.

So, we won't get into it here on the comments of whether people like Slack or not. I know within our group, there are some people who love it and some people who hate it, but the problem is we have to build tools that are usable across the whole community, at least at some level. Comments, questions?

Recommendation 11 then. Replace ATLAS with five regional meetings every two to three years. We are rejecting that. They seem to have ignored our general assemblies, even though in another place in the document they recognize that we hold them, and we believe ATLAS is exceedingly important to make sure that we do things cross-region – at least occasionally – and bringing people together across the whole organization, although expensive, is something that we believe is absolutely mandatory to make At-Large work as a unit.

And in addition to that, they are recommending five meetings every two to three years. That averages two GAs per year, which means we'd have to have a GA at two out of three meetings. That I think would generate an unreasonable load for volunteers, staff, and meeting people. Whether it is [even] financially viable, I don't think anyone's done the arithmetic. It may well be possible to hold more than five GAs for the cost of a summit, but the other resources are not something that we have access to even if the money is not an issue. Sébastien, go right ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you very much, Alan. Yes, I would have said that I strongly reject this proposal. And it's one of the points where I really think that four people coming from outside can't be more intelligent than the whole At-Large. And we have sought and Olivier have led this work to set up a calendar, see about how we can organize all that, the GA and the ATLAS, and really, I think that we have lost time and money in those type of discussion with them because they don't know what they are talking about, and I guess we know. And that's why I would like to – maybe you add somewhere that we had set up a calendar with all that taken into account. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. I think pretty much everyone on the Board committee that's going to be reviewing this is well aware of that. They're the same people who approved that, this whole calendar and funding just a few months ago. So, I'm not particularly worried about that.

I think your comment that this is a good recommendation – but not the only one – that illustrates the fact that they really did not understand – not that they didn’t agree, but they seem to have missed some of the points that we were making to them even though they were made one on one in ways that were very hard to miss.

So, it is a good illustration, and there are a number of places in the feasibility study where we do point this out, that these are good examples where they simply clearly did not understand what we were trying to do. Because if they had, they could have rebutted – we may not have agreed with what they said, but they could have rebutted our particular arguments. But they chose to ignore them as if they had never been said. And I find that very problematic.

Sébastien, is that a new hand or an old one?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, please, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead. We’re doing okay on time at this point.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, but it will be short. But just to slightly disagree with you with the fact that the Board knows. I can tell you that the Board each year change, and even if you think it’s repetition, it is not. Some of the new Board members will ask again and again the same question, and since we are having a Board member selected by At-Large, I know that each

year we have to repeat what we have said, and it's why I suggest that we don't take as granted that everybody in the Board knows what we are talking about. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sébastien. I did say everyone on this committee, the committee that's going to be looking at it. But your point is well taken, and the feasibility study does include a reference to the financial plan that was approved, and includes a link to it.

But I'll also note that one of the issues that has been raised a number of times is, why are we rushing to get this done so quickly? And part of the answer is we really want this to go through the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and the Board before the Board changes.

Many of these people have lived through this process with us. Many of them attended the face-to-face meeting where the ITEMS group made their presentation. And I think it's really important that we not have a complete exchange of people when we have this report and this feasibility study reviewed. So, that's one of the reasons that we're doing this now and not saying, "Let's just wait until Abu Dhabi before we approve this," for that very reason.

But that being said, we don't leave out any of the things in the document. They are referenced and with pretty explicit details. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I think that somewhere in the report, we have to make it clear that this reviewer, these reviewers either didn't understand the whole At-Large, or they came with an established point of view and they came to implement it.

We have to take all the recommendations that are unlogical and with no – how to say – that cannot be accepted because they don't understand the nature of At-Large, or perhaps ICANN too. This will help the Board not to make the same mistake and appoint this kind of reviewers. Unfortunately, they did, and they appointed them for another review [inaudible] Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, they were appointed for other reviews while this one was going on, not with the full knowledge of what has happened here. So, just to be clear. Tijani, if you could – once this call is over or in the next day, but not a lot later, take a look at the executive summary. There is a paragraph there –

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Hello, this is Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Seun, we'll put you in the queue. There is a section in the executive summary which does try to – not in detailed terms, but does talk about the level of dissatisfaction that we had with the review process, and some of the reasons. So, take a look at that, and if you have any

comments on it, then we can certainly make changes at that level. Seun, go right ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I have my hand up as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. I didn't notice. I was looking at the executive summary. Seun, go ahead, and then Cheryl.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Just a point of information, the [inaudible] selected by ASO or by NRO... is not an [addition] of the ICANN Board. That was done by NRO EC. So [inaudible] has been correct to say that they went ahead and selected ITEMS so it is solely the addition of the numbers community to select and then pay for that job. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I believe that is not correct. This is a report commissioned by ICANN of multi-stakeholder engagement groups, but that doesn't really matter. I do believe this is an ICANN-supported thing, not an ASO/NRO one. But we can look into that.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just specifically to Tijani’s point – and I agree, I think it’s covered well enough in this document in the executive summary – but this is not the ideal document for that point to be made, Tijani.

There is, in fact, a separate activity which the working party will be going through with MSSI and that is a proper debrief and opinions sort on our exact experience as there is a phase to what we do, which is not, I would suggest, ideally in this feasibility and implementation plan, but rather, on the specific “What did we feel as a result of our review process?” part of the work.

But based on the observations made of our experiences, they, MSSI had already implemented significant change with the way that the terms of reference for future organizational reviews will be, and in fact, are currently being done. So it already had influence, Tijani, so I think that’s a good thing, but this is not our only opportunity to make those points and I would suggest it’s probably not the best opportunity to make those points. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. And Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. I guess both Cheryl and you are right. I don’t know exactly the details for today’s situation, but I remember that NRO was, in fact, the last one who finally selected. But I guess it’s done by staff to

do the work because then we don't have the staff to do that. And it's shared work between NRO and ICANN staff.

And I don't know where [inaudible] today, but last time I looked at that, that was [LT] NRO like the staff is [helping] At-Large and at the end, as the report is going to NRO and the NRO will take action on that and not the ICANN Board if I remember well and if it's still the case, but I guess it's [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Sébastien. If all of that is so, and I have no reason to doubt you, that's number one, news to me, and number two, it's really interesting because we were told that under no conditions could anyone in At-Large or ALAC be involved in the selection process, so interesting that different rules apply to different people, perhaps if you have enough money to pay for it yourself.

But we'll leave those comments out for now. They don't really apply to the [R] report that we're talking about today.

All right, I think we've exhausted the speaker queue, most of which was not on recommendation 11, but we'll go on at this point, to recommendation 12.

Outreach participation in more regional meetings. We support it. We note that that implies significant funding, period. If anyone disagrees and says we don't want more funding, you can put your hand up now. That was a joke. Not a good one, perhaps.

Recommendation 13, clearly publicized travel funding opportunities and beneficiaries in one place. We support it in principle. We do not believe it is wise to duplicate information since many of the funding opportunities are generated by other parts of the organization and document them within their parts of the web or wiki. We do not think it's reasonable to duplicate information that just ends up causing problems and confusion.

We support the concept of transparency, beneficiaries and benefits, but we do not believe it should be limited to At-Large – and At-Large should be spelled with a capital L on that slide – but should apply to everyone, not only the ACs/SOs, but Review Teams, for instance.

This Review Team went to an awful lot of meetings. We have no idea how much money they spent, and it's not clear we shouldn't have knowledge of that. And I believe, and our report says we believe, that this should apply to the Boards and staff as well.

And lastly, I and many people in At-Large are getting very, very tired about identifying how much things cost to get volunteers to work and never mentioning the implications of the volunteer work that many of us put into it, some of us at real physical, real cost, both lost revenue and out-of-pocket costs which are not factored into any of these calculations. One unnamed person will say that was the favorite part in the report.

Anyone have any comments? We have various people typing. Would you like me to wait for you?

What is the cost of tourism? I don't know, Olivier. What is the cost of tourism? Some of us, when we do any tourism, do it out of our own pocket and not on ICANN time. And yes, we may go piggyback on the trip that they've... on the airplane fare that they provided to get us to the meeting. Sarcasm, sarcasm. Got it.

All right, next recommendation, please. Fourteen, request auction funds, to use auction funds. There are several typos in that statement. What it's trying to say is – that recommendation says we should request from an appropriate CCWG or an appropriate working group, the use of auction funds for At-Large operational expenses.

We reject that. It is counter to the projected use of funds when they were originally described in the Applicant Guidebook and the CCWG is not empowered to grant such a request anyway.

Next recommendation. Recommendation 15, send outreach rapporteurs to ICANN meetings. We reject with qualification. It is unclear what outreach rapporteurs are or what they would do at ICANN meetings, but we note that there are times when there are outreach opportunities at ICANN meetings and ALAC should consider them when applicable, and in the example of the indigenous people's fellowship, we initiated it.

I don't think there's much else to be said about that. I'm not quite sure why it is we should be going to ICANN meetings to do outreach when most of the people at these meetings are, in fact, already at ICANN meetings and are either committed to At-Large or not.

Next slide, since there don't seem to be any hands.

And the last slide, adopt metrics for the entire At-Large community to measure impact of EMM. We support with qualification. We reject EMM, but nevertheless, support metrics. Some are in place. We understand the need and desire for metrics for non-leader contributions, but they're difficult and we have struggled with this for a long time, and we will again try to work on this. But it's an area which we know is going to be difficult. How do you recognize someone is contributing? Simply being on a call or posting a message to a mailing list where the substance of that contribution is minimal probably is not sufficient.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I am really sad when you repeat the same things. Yes, yes, there is a different point of view about metrics, but let's start doing something. There was a lot of [inaudible]. I made the full proposal. Other people made proposals. Please go ahead. We have to go ahead and implement them. We have to adopt something. We have to do something.

I am sad with people who say volunteers don't have to have metrics. I don't agree at all. If you are a volunteer, you're already committed and if you are committed, you have to respect your commitment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. I don't think anyone in this current go-around has said volunteers shouldn't need metrics. Yes, there are some people who have said it over the years. I don't think it's a position we have adopted, but we have struggled to actually find out, figure out how to do metrics appropriately.

But in any case, that's going to be the implementation and it is going to be difficult. We can pretend it's going to be easy but I think we're going to be struggling with this and work on it for quite a while until we get it to a stage where we're reasonably happy.

Any further comments on this one? This may well be one of the more difficult ones to implement.

Next slide. And I'll open the floor to any general comments, and I'll also open the floor to if Cheryl or Holly – I don't know if Holly is on the call or not – but certainly if Cheryl or if Holly, if she's here, would like to make any further comments about the report or the process, this would be a good time to do it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. Holly was unable to be brought onto the call. Staff did try and I'm sure there's just a technical glitch because I know she had intended to be here, so I shall try and channel her.

I'm very pleased with this presentation and on behalf of Holly and I, I certainly would like to hope that the At-Large Advisory Committee who Alan will shortly be asking to give their in principle and in support to this

document are as pleased with the clarity and outcomes in this particular document that your review working party has created.

Now whilst the regionally based review working party will continue its work – in fact, it'll be continuing its work from meetings next week in preparation for our next step, so this is just a milestone for us rather than a wrapping up in any way, shape, or form of the project.

I would like to mention to the ALAC just before they go into their deliberations on this how much Holly and I appreciate, and I do mean deeply appreciate, the additional effort that was undertaken not only by our fabulous staff, but also [is] the staff that are in support of this activity, but also our ad hoc drafting team. And here, I want to sing aloud in particular, Olivier from his orchestration of not only direct input but also the excellent webinar which was very, very well attended throughout the regional leadership, and will be on regional leaders the other day.

But also, Alan and Maueen, and of course, we did have other people on that drafting team, but the lion's share of the contributions that so many of you put into it and thanks, one and all. It really was carried by those few people, so a huge effort. Having gone through this before with the At-Large committee, I would like to suggest despite the, shall we say challenges, during this process, that we are in a better, more organized, more well-articulated place at this point in the process than we were considerably further on the last time we had a review, so just a personal vote of thanks from Holly and I.

Thank you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I was going to thank the various people whose effort went into getting this final document to where it is right now and who will be working over the next couple of weeks to finalize it.

You did leave out one person, though.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: That person is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I was starting to do a review of the document the other day and I got on and I noticed Cheryl was detail going through line by line and making various comments. And then she stopped and so I asked her why, and eventually she answered saying, oh, she's lost connectivity but she's driven for 15 minutes to the nearest free access Wi-Fi point she could find so she could complete her comments and I don't even know what time is what on some weekend. But thank you, Cheryl. The amount of effort that Cheryl put into it goes along with what she described for other people, so it was a joint effort of a lot of people, so thank you all.

Sorry, 15 kilometers. I thought it was 15 minutes. I don't think it matters, but thank you for the accuracy.

Are there any other comments before we go onto the next part which is actually coming to a decision? And just for the record, there were a

number of comments made on the webinar last week. I think you will find them all incorporated in the document.

All right. Whereas ICANN commissioned an organizational review, delete one of those reviews. The word in the “whereas” of the At-Large community which was conducted in 2016-2017, the ALAC and the At-Large Review Working Party in conjunction with the entire At-Large community have reviewed the final review report and developed a feasibility study to be presented to the Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee, OEC. Therefore, the ALAC approves the feasibility study presented at the ALAC monthly meeting on the 22nd of August, 2017 in principle and subject to final cosmetic and clarity editing, approve submission to the OEC.

We have a question from Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you, Alan. Two points, and whereas, ICANN, we can discuss what it is, but here I guess it’s ICANN Board who commissions because it’s the gTLD of the Board [inaudible] review.

And my second point, I think, I know that we write entire At-Large community, but I think we need to raise the [inaudible] and just [inaudible] the rule of the RALOs in this specific work. And that’s it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Can you propose wording there?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's not always a good thing to ask [inaudible] wording, but for the first one, ICANN Board Commission. That's quite [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. No, that one is noted and staff will make the appropriate change. Let me try that and tell me if I hit what you're saying.

Okay, the ALAC and the At-Large Review Party in conjunction with representatives of the At-Large community and the RALOs, does that catch it?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My suggestion is in conjunction with the five RALOs and the entire At-Large community and blah, blah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I like that wording, so the ALAC and the At-Large Review Working Party in conjunction with the five regional At-Large organizations and the entire At-Large community have reviewed. Is that captured by staff? Yes, and we have the recording if necessary. Thank you, Sébastien. I think the motion is better for both of those changes.

Any further discussion? Then I would like to call the vote and if we could actually do a roll call of this, I would appreciate it.

ARIEL LIANG: Alan, I believe you want me to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't really care who does it, but yes, that would be fine.

ARIEL LIANG: I will do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. People don't have to answer with voice. A tick mark is fine.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. And just for beginning, I want to mention that Maureen Hilyard will be the proxy for Holly Raiche. Maureen just notified me that, and then Leon Sanchez also mentioned Alan Greenberg will be his proxy and we have two other ALAC members are not present in this call. They are Alberto Soto and Garth Bruen, so I will [inaudible] with them.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll cover them afterwards.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, great. So what I will do is I will just read each person's name and you can say yes, no, or abstain for this motion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and a tick mark, which if you're making a tick mark, please leave it up and that's taken to be a yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Okay, so I will just read out the people who have tick marks yes. So that's Bastiaan Goslings and Harold Arcos, and I will record that on the side too.

And the next one is Javier Rua-Jovet and the next one is Kaili Kan, Maureen Hilyard, and I will do that also for Holly Raiche, and no Sébastien Bachollet, and that's the ones I have recorded that showed tick mark in Adobe Connect. So for the rest of the people, Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I vote yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Andrei Kolesnikov? I believe Andrei is on mobile. I will get that to Andre after this. And so, Alan, I believe you will vote yes for [Liam] as well because you already talked to me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. And Seun Ojedeji?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. I vote yes. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. And last, Wafa Dahmani? I will get back to Wafa and Andrei. Maybe they have some mobile accessibility issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so Wafa and Andrei, and Alberto, and Garth. Is that correct?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, that is correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: So at this point, we should have 11 votes yes and 4 to be received.

ARIEL LIANG: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, our rules allow for the vote to be extended for several days to allow those votes to be collected and I will presume that Ariel or somebody will be doing that and be forwarding back to us.

I thank you all very much. This has been an exhaustive process, exhausting process, and exhaustive, and I would like to thank everyone for the amount of work that was put into this process. It sometimes feels that all the work is done by only a few people as the reviewers claimed was always the case. That was not the case in this particular effort, and it's really heartening.

I hope this will continue in the actual work we're supposed to be doing as supposed to this, which to some extent, is a "make work" job. But I thank everyone for the effort and the time that everyone has invested into this issue.

It was pointed out to me I didn't confirm that the vote is quorate. It is quorate since we have more than 8 people on the call and with 11 votes so far, it has already passed but we will complete the roster to make sure that we have votes from everyone, or at least, attempt to have votes from everyone.

And the next item on our agenda is – and I've lost the piece of paper – I suspect it is ICANN60. Yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, it is ICANN60 and I believe that Gisella is going to be covering most of this. So I'm going to hand it over to Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Yes, thank you, Alan and Heidi. ICANN60, I'm going to be displaying the block schedule for ICANN60 which was posted on the website yesterday and less there is any further comment, we will be working on this block schedule which will be made available to everyone on the ICANN60 At-Large main page.

We will start the At-Large scheduling this week. We will have the first scheduling committee call this week, later on this week, and a survey will also hopefully be sent out by close of business today, Tuesday the 22nd of August to allow everyone to give their input on the groups to meet with as well as the topics to be discussed. We also have the APRALO General Assembly, but I will hand that over to Maureen to give us a little bit more information on all the activities to expect at ICANN60.

And as we develop the At-Large schedule, it will be regularly updated on the ICANN60 At-Large wiki page and we will, at the next ALAC meeting, be looking through this as well as on the ALT meetings, so you're welcome to join. I don't have any further input at this stage. Thank you. Over to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Gisella.

Yeah, I think we've gone over this several times and I guess this is just a slight update. As you know, the assembly, I forget what it's organized for – organizing committees, of course, and Holly is in charge of capacity building and [inaudible] has been based on a survey that was actually given out to our ALS and individual members. And so the process – I can't remember the topics, but the program is developing.

I'm in charge of the logistics, so the sort of things that are in a showcase, and of course, I'm working very closely with Ali who is the man on the ground and is seeking local sponsorships for our event. I know he's trying to coordinate – well, his head is coordinated funding for a showcase. We have for catering and also for entertainment.

He's trying to get a sponsor to fund the APRALO dinner to which we would like – I think we're inviting ALAC members. But don't quote me on it, though.

And of course, our fourth group is the ALS coordination and outreach group, which is being run by Leona. And with, I've asked several times but we really do want to coordinate with other outreach activities that are taking place within the roots of the ICANN communities, so we need to get some feedback from that.

And yes, we have a few other activities too, where, for example, very recently the Fellows did a survey and so we're, we've got some of the Fellows from APRALO are getting together sort of like a short research on the APRALO sort of like component of that particular survey and to make recommendations on how we, as a RALO, can sort of like interact

more [inaudible] with our Fellows to try and get them engaged, more actively engaged in the ICANN community.

I think that's it for me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else, Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Nothing at this stage. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The only other thing is logistics. Everyone, I believe, should have gotten invitation letters by now and should be in the process of making travel arrangements. Please, if you have not gotten a letter and you believe you should have – and we're talking about ALAC members, liaisons, and regional leaders – then please let staff and let me know, and if there are problems going forward, don't just work on it quietly. Make sure someone, one of us, is aware of it if there are any issues even in regard to visas or issues regarding making travel arrangements, please let us know so there aren't any surprises at the last moment.

Anything else before we go on to Any Other Business? Then I will turn it first over to Olivier, and then I think Holly also has an announcement, but Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I just wanted to give you a very quick update, wearing my hat of one of the co-Chairs of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. The other co-Chairs, the one for the Generic Name Supporting Organization, Rafik Dammak, and the co-Chair for the Country Code Names Supporting Organization is Young-Eum Lee.

We had a face-to-face meeting that took place in the last ICANN meeting in Johannesburg and have received a list of points of concerns from the Generic Name Supporting Organization, regarding the way that the CCWG was run and also regarding, so the actual operation of the CCWG, but also regarding the suitability of this group of people working together, being organized as a Cross-Community Working Group, namely because when this Cross-Community Working Group was created, the GNSO rules on Cross-Community Working Groups had not been created yet. And now that they have, this Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance does not quite fit the box that a Cross-Community Working Group is supposed to be according to the GNSO definition.

Anyway, this was put aside and one of the discussions that has taken place in Johannesburg was that, perhaps, searching for a different type of vehicle for the Cross-Community Working Group, perhaps, a working party, or a committee, or whatever else we would call it, but with the same types of privileges – privileges being not as in privileged, but as in the ability to conduct meetings during ICANN meetings, book a room, etc., the ability to have ICANN staff support, etc. – if those conditions are met, then perhaps, another vehicle can be created from scratch.

This is what Rafik Dammak is now working on in our Cross-Community Working Group. So we should have a proposal that should be on the table by the next ICANN meeting.

This is quite important because in the meantime, the GNSO has filed a motion to proceed forward with removing themselves from the Cross-Community Working Group, but in a matter that would allow for another vehicle to take its place in the meantime. That's the process on one side.

On the other side, the activities of the Working Group itself, well, we've obviously been continuing to monitor what's going on outside the ICANN space, especially in activities such as the ITU work that is taking place and also the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology. Of course, it being the summer, things are a little slow. But one process which has moved forward is the one of the Internet Governance Forum.

Our workshop, the workshop proposed by the Working Group, was accepted by the IGF and the workshop is entitled "Multi-Stakeholder Governance of the Domain Name System: Lessons Learned for Other Internet Governance Issues."

So the overall name now, I think the name that was accepted was "The Advantages of the Multi-Stakeholder Governance in Administering the Domain Name System." We have an interesting list of people that have been selected or that have been proposed to be on this panel.

And so, at present, we are designing the agenda. We, as the working group, is designing the agenda, and hopefully it will make for a very interesting session.

There are no At-Large people per se in the list of speakers because we had to follow the stakeholder qualifications of the IGF and the stakeholder qualifications do not make much of a difference between an end user and civil society, so at the danger of having too many civil society people on the panel, we couldn't have somebody from At-Large, but I do hope that there will be a lot of people from At-Large taking part in this year's IGF and that we'll be able to discuss their point of view.

It's important to note that although this is a workshop, the format is a roundtable, so input from our community will be absolutely needed. And that's really all from this month's activities from the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Olivier. Just for the record, this would not be an unreasonable thing to do during reports in the future, although perhaps not quite as extensive. I would like to raise an objection that, if indeed, we are using the IGF terms of civil society, that should not by default go to other parts of ICANN as if it is their God-given right. We can talk about this further. Tijani and then Sébastien.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much, Alan and Olivier. First of all, you are speaking, Olivier, about a workshop proposed by the Internet Governance Working Group, isn't it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, that is correct. Yeah, that is correct. Yeah, I am reporting on the work the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. So I think that the workshop is the ICANN workshop and since it is the ICANN workshop on Internet Governance, it must represent, more or less, all the parties participating in this working group, and At-Large is one of the founders of this working group.

So yes, in IGF, the stakeholders are governments, civil society, the private sector, and international organizations. But we, as At-Large, as ICANN, we have to give the image of ICANN, not the image that the IGF requires.

The IGF anyway, asks you to have diversity. They don't say you have to have exactly the same number from each stakeholder. And the diversity that is three-dimensional diversity that the IGF is asking for: stakeholders, gender, and regional diversity. And you may have more civil society than government or than private sector. This is not a problem. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. I will not argue with the GNSO, but I want to [support] with Alan’s side and it’s one of the reasons I was struggling not to use civil society within ICANN. It would not build up the [inaudible] and now we have a real risk to be eaten like in the IGF and we have to be very careful on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Olivier will take this under advisement.

Heidi, do you have an announcement you’d like to make?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, yes. I just wanted to bring your attention to an announcement that was made today, and particularly for EURALO, that Michael Yavushev, who is the current Head of Global Stakeholder Engagement for Eastern Europe and Central Asia, will be leaving ICANN in September and taking his place, will be Alexandra Kulikova who’s currently manager for that region. She’ll be keeping an eye on, taking over that role. I just wanted to let you know about that and I will post the announcement in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Any further comments before we adjourn the meeting, early for once? I thank you all for that.

Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, I'll call this meeting to an end. Thank you all for your participation, and some of us at hours which are less than optimal, and we'll see you all online. Bye-bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you all very much. Thank you all again. Please don't forget to disconnect your lines from the AC room and the bridge. Thanks again very much, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]