
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team monthly call on Monday, 18th of September, 2017 at 17:30 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche. We also have our incoming ALT Seun Ojedeji, Bartlett Morgan, Maureen Hilyard, Bastiaan Goslings. We also have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, and Maureen Hilyard. Apologies noted from Julie Hammer.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yeşim Nazlar, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

If I could just remind you all please to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the agenda? It has changed a little bit in the last hour or two, I don't think in ways that are significant or worrisome, but if there are any comments. I hear nothing, see nothing. Therefore, we will accept the agenda as [displayed].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Tijani, go ahead.

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.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, from time to time you disappear and then you come back, so there is a problem in your voice, in your audio.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, there are people who would prefer if I just disappear altogether. Is that any better now?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Now it is better, and it is not me who wants you to disappear [at this time].

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know what I was doing to cause it to go down, but let's assume I will talk clearly and into the phone. If there's a problem, please let me know, someone. I see Andrei has joined the call.

The first substantive agenda item is Policy Development Activities. I'll turn it over to Ariel to tell us whether there's anything that we need to focus on. Please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. We have two public comments in progress. One is on the Proposed Changes to the NCUC Charter. Vanda Scartezini has volunteered to draft a statement. In fact, she drafted one and I posted on the wiki. But there may be some problems with this statement, so

we haven't sent the call for comments message to the entire At-Large community. So maybe, Alan, you want to talk about this one.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I do. I understand Vanda sent a message saying she's willing to. I don't believe we made a decision that we need to make a statement, nor have I seen a real rationale for why a statement might be necessary. As we noted earlier in a previous call, our norm is unless there's something really onerous in the charter for another group that we don't normally try to micromanage.

This one is particularly difficult because neither the NCUC nor ICANN staff have provided any sort of redlines, so we don't really know what the changes are. Vanda's comments seem to apply to the new charter, but it's not clear that they're changes.

I have some worry that we're going ahead and drafting something without really having made a decision. I haven't looked at the charter myself. I did ask staff for a red line and they said, "Sorry. We don't have one." I think it's rather poor practice to revise a charter and not explain carefully what the changes are, but I'm not sure we can do anything about that.

There is also no Word document available for the original one, so we can't compare them other than trying to make Word documents out of the PDFs, which I have not tried to do at this point.

Open the floor, comments. Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan. I actually did read the document. Again, unclear as to whether that was the changed or the unchanged. Regardless, it's very unclear to me what we would say anyway, so I'd probably vote for no comment at this stage.

ALAN GREENBERG: You certainly and click on the link and see what Vanda has commented. She has a number of comments on each of the sections.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm aware of that. I just remember reading [these things and thinking], "Why are we being asked to comment?"

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so I will ask Vanda, "Is there a compelling reason and are the comments relevant to the changes as opposed to the charter?"

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything further on this one? I'm taking it that although no one else has made a comment, the consensus is similar to Holly's that unless we have a compelling reason we should not be making a comment on this. That doesn't mean we shouldn't if there is a compelling reason. I see a tick from Maureen. Nothing else from anyone else. We'll go ahead. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The next one in progress is the Proposed Dates for ICANN Public Meetings 2021-2023. Yrjö has volunteered to check this public comment. He is in this call today. Yrjö, do you have any update on this public comment? Yrjö has [just raised his hand].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yrjö, please go ahead if you can speak. His microphone says it's muted. Now unmuted.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, Alan. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, okay. I jumped on this one because I wanted to say something about the clash of the summer meetings with the mid-summer festivals in certain parts of Europe. But perhaps I now have second thoughts. Perhaps this is not something for ALAC to comment on because people from those parts of Europe are just a small part of ALAC. So perhaps I will just make those comments personal.

Perhaps there is no compelling [rules and order] for ALAC to make a comment on it, but I would like to hear your opinion. I have actually written the comment, but I just hesitate to put it forward because it

may be, as I said, just a self-interest or small special interest for a few [northern] people. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I do have an opinion, but I see Olivier has his hand up so, Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I was just going to say if we do decide that this is not an ALAC thing, would this perhaps fit as a EURALO statement? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's nothing to stop anyone from making a statement whether we make one or not. Anyone else want in before I make a comment? Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I do think that even if it is proper to Europe, I think that At-Large as whole can make a comment on that. We are trying to find all the dates that are not convenient for the whole community. So when we spoke about the religious dates for, for example, Muslims, it will not affect, for example, Olivier but Olivier is part of people who agree on avoiding this kind of date. So I think that if we have to make comments on that, we should do it as an At-Large comment not as EURALO only. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Nothing precludes comments at various levels, both from individual to RALO in addition to the ALAC if the ALAC chooses to.

Let me give my position. It is not going to be possible to find a set of dates that work for everybody without any problem. When you combine traditional festivals and events with religious ones and national ones and you add in things like, certainly in the U.S. and Canada and I think in Europe, things like Mother's Day where ICANN is always during as far as I can tell and for that matter people's birthdays, we're going to have conflicts. There is no possible way we can not have conflicts.

All we can try to do is avoid the more critical ones, assuming we can put relative ones on them that are celebrated by very large numbers of people. So I would suspect it's going to be impossible to never have anything during Ramadan, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't try to avoid the last few days. The same is true for Jewish holidays and Christian holidays. It would be foolish to try to hold something over Christmas because just too many people want to celebrate that. But at some level, we are going to have inconveniences and overlaps as we go forward.

I would like to see an ALAC statement, in fact. I would like to see it with the preamble saying we know we're not going to be able to avoid everything, but ICANN should endeavor to avoid the most sensitive or critical of dates where we have a reasonably large number of participants.

I suspect if you map out national holidays, there's probably not a week in the calendar that doesn't have one. So we're not going to be able to avoid everything, but we do want to try to avoid the more critical ones. I think the statement should say something like that and list a few that have been mentioned by people within our group as to try to avoid. But I think we need to be somewhat reasonable about it.

I see a few tick marks. Yrjö, I think you have marching orders.

Next, Ariel? Anything else?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes, there's one more thing: the Proposed Renewal of the .MUSEUM Sponsored Registry Agreement. That public comment will close on October 3. So [we have to make decisions] whether to [help draft] statement or not.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's one of the domains, the TLDs that was added in an earlier round. It has doggedly stayed alive and has relatively little presence. I cannot see the import of ALAC making a statement on that unless someone knows something I don't. It is open only to real museums. It has no real impact on users other than if a museum chooses to use it. Sadly perhaps for the TLD, I know of no museums that actually do. Although, I'm sure there are some because if they're paying fees, I assume there's some presence.

All right, let's go on to the next agenda item then, and that's Updates from Liaisons or updates from liaisons or anyone else that feels the

need to give us a verbal update at this point. Anyone? Cheryl, go right ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. If there's an echo, it will be because someone else's line is open. So if all other lines can get closed, that will help with the echoes, I've discovered. At least [inaudible].

First of all, the GNSO Council meeting is a couple of days after our ALAC Leadership Team call. It's on 20 September, in a couple of days' time. There are two things on vote.

The council will be voting on the review of the rights protection mechanism in all gTLD [starter] requests. That should go through after the relevant discussion, I think, without a great deal of difficulty.

The second one that is of some interest but not overly concerning is the council vote on the Cross-Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names. This is the wrapping up or closing up of the cross-community working group that was recently run between the ccNSO and the GNSO. So that really is a fairly simple process, but we do need to make sure that's done properly.

What is important is in that some of the notes [to the resolve] which do identify the need for any future activity in geographic names and gTLDs to be open and inclusive to all parties within ICANN. That of course is important to us in the world of At-Large, but it is already being reflected with the [Work Team 5] development out of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. So that's important. It's important historically. It's

important as a priority to have written in stone, so to speak. But I see no concern with that going through.

The only other vote will be a formality one, which is for the members of the ATRT3. They are by my reading – although the names are missing at this stage, they’ll come through in a short while I would expect – there were nine applications received. They can put up to seven, and I believe it is three names that will be going forward.

So with that, I can just say that from the last meeting, which I have reported to you intersessionally on, the matter of the cross-community working group on the Internet Governance Forum was [only] dealt with and I kept Olivier in particular up-to-date on that as well. That’s it for me, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have several hands. Yrjö, is that a new hand or an old one?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: That’s a new hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: I was trying to get Mark Carvell who is the U.K. representative on the GAC to participate at this meeting and to present a paper on the

community-based applications, something he has been working on for the GAC. As we have discussed earlier, this is a [possible] area for GAC/ALAC cooperation. Unfortunately, he's too busy with the preparations for the G7 ICT Ministers meeting. But let's keep this for the next ALAC meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yrjö, is that the same paper that was distributed several months ago, or is this something new?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yes, it is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes to what?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, what? It is the same one? Or, yes, it's new?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: I'm sorry. It is the same paper. Well, I will say that it's based on the Council of Europe paper on the [CBAs], which the GAC [took up] and which was also distributed to all ALAC members. So it is the same paper.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so it's based on it, but it is actually a new document?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yes. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. What are people's feelings? I would think that this might be an interesting thing to schedule in Abu Dhabi. We will have one more ALAC meeting. I think it's far more an ALAC meeting issue than an ALT issue. I think we have one meeting scheduled in October. I don't think we're cancelling that. So that is an opportunity, but that's very close to the Abu Dhabi meeting itself. I would tend to think that it might be a better thing to simply schedule it for the Abu Dhabi meeting. Obviously, we can invite one or two other GAC members in if they thought that was appropriate. What do people think on that? Anyone please jump in if you have a comment on that. Don't worry about the queue. Holly says she agrees. Tijani, if it's on this topic, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I think it's important to have as a subject of cooperation with the GAC. The community-based applications were, if you remember [when in the] [inaudible] working group for the support of the applicants who need assistance. I think that the last round was very bad for developing countries but also for community-based applications.

Remember that the only applications that have been accepted for the support have been dropped by the panel on community application and now we don't have anyone. I think it is a subject for us for the At-Large

for the end user. It is a very important subject, and we need to really have a cooperation with the GAC on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think there's any question at all that it's important to us and we can cooperate on the GAC. The question is, do we want Mark to present this paper to us? Please, let's just focus on that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It would be good.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, you say yes. I hear you. Olivier and Maureen, comments on this particular issue?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not on this issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, not from me either.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, the question for staff is, are we having a meeting in October? It's not on the calendar. Almost nothing is on the calendar for October at this point. Anyone from staff? Can someone tell me what date of October it would be if we had it?

[HEIDI ULLRICH]: Gisella, are you able to respond to that?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Alan. Which meeting was that? I'm [here], I'm just looking at the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: ALAC. ALAC monthly meeting.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, the ALAC, absolutely is – sorry if it's not there. It should be. On the 24th.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is virtually nothing except the RALO meetings on the October calendar.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, Alan those are the only ones we've got [searched]. But, yes, it will be October 24 at 21:00. Sorry if it's not on there. Just bear with me for a

second. Yes, the September meeting is at 12:00 UTC, so the October meeting will be at 21:00 UTC to work through the rotation.

ALAN GREENBERG: That would mean I might not be able to attend that meeting because I don't remember exactly when my plane is that evening.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, Alan. You leave, according to this, at 01:00 UTC the day before. So we've literally put together a list of all the RALO calls, and I've also listed the ALAC call to see exactly if we need to bring it forward by a few days, etc. So if you just bear with me for 24 hours, I'll send that out to you just to point this out again that on the 24th it will be at that time. Maybe we can do it at an earlier time to suit you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I would think given that it's within a day or so of everyone getting on planes that if we're going to have an ALAC meeting that month, we should do it the week earlier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. I agree.

[HEIDI ULLRICH]: Yes, from staff support side as well that would be better.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, let us put out a notice saying we're scheduling it for the 17th instead of the 24th.

All right, back to the original queue. I have a couple of comments, before we go on to other people, on Cheryl's comments. Number one, on Work Track 5, is it your belief, hope, or something in light of the original announcement saying this is going to be run sort of like a CCWG and the GNSO statements saying, well, this really has to be run under GNSO rules, are we likely to have things like the five members per AC/SO as the decisional body if ever a decision has to be made?

I'm asking for an opinion at this point, not a guarantee. Is it your opinion that's the direction, or is that forbidden by the GNSO belief that it has to be run like a GNSO PDP?

One second. Yrjö's microphone is on causing [an echo]. Can we have that muted please? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

A work track, just like a [inaudible] group in a CCWG merely makes recommendations to the plenary. Therefore, any decisional process going on in a work track never goes to a vote. You have a consensus call and you can have dissenting opinions [sent], but it's the plenary that would decide.

Now the plenary, the PDP group as a whole, doesn't have a balance voting/nonvoting, member/nonmember situation. So at this stage, I don't imagine that there would be that as a formal likelihood.

What is important, however, is that each of the interested component parts of ICANN in the geo regions issues have the equivalent of members and we should send them as members because we have members and participants in these. But those people need to be active in the meetings and influencing the outcomes as well as any consensus calls being made on those recommendations.

If you want to think of it as sending it and running as a microcosm, feel free to do so. But if push comes to shove, it will run like all of the other work tracks. That really depends on, as you well know, having people at the meetings making influential comments, building consensus, and being there and making their voices heard when a consensus call is made. We try and avoid votes like the plague. Does that help?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. It doesn't give me a warm feeling that across the ACs and SOs this is going to help us come to closure, but whatever it is, it is.

One other question for Cheryl: you said the GNSO will likely submit three names. I would have thought on something like this they would have at least added a fourth for the four stakeholder groups, but they are not as you understand it at the moment?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

There are seven names altogether. Three names are being put forward as primary.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And four other names [inaudible] including all other comments and agreements to earlier items. And there are four names in a prioritized [inaudible] any positions that become available. For example, assuming that a name as well known in the [ATRT] world as Brian Cote is accepted by the GNSO, and I can't imagine it wouldn't be, and then Brian became, for example, the chair of an ATRT as he has done before, then it would be the next of their reserve names to come up to replace him. But it's not looking at various component parts all having a seat at the table, thank heavens.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Last I heard in other review teams, being the chair does not remove you as a representative of that group. [I'm] certain that has not been the case in the past. In any case, all right, who else would like to speak?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was just a hypothetical. There are four names in review.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. Thank you. Holly, your hand is up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, it shouldn't be. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Because Cheryl spoke earlier about the different work streams and the update on the different work streams, I just wanted to remind you all for those people that weren't able to make it to that call, the last ICANN At-Large evolution call had a very good summary from all of the updates of the different work streams. I'm putting a link into the chat about this in case that's of interest to you. The transcripts are also ready now, so if you don't have the time to listen to the whole call, you can just jump through the transcript. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to bring to your attention that the joint working group, the ccNSO and SSAC group, finally made a decision that is a joint decision agreed upon. It went to the Council and they were to make a vote by 8 September. There's only one person who actually raised any issue. This is from the ccNSO.

But I think that Hiro and Wafa who were the two ccNSO candidates on the working group explained the issues that Ching raised that related to why the ccNSO had actually accepted any change to their [lower case] the whole confusability issue. Katrina said it was going to be a majority

vote anyway, so I'd say that the report that they made has been accepted to go to the Board.

The other issue was to do with the PDP on retirement which I'm involved in which has been quite [serious] lately. I've written those up in my report anyway, but those have been the two main issues. Otherwise, it has been quite quiet. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I presume the SSAC has agreed to whatever the report going to the Board is.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. No, no, no. It has been jointly agreed upon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you summarize the substance?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, fine. Cheryl, you're next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks for just giving Maureen time to [turn the mic off].

Just Olivier reminded me when he made that intervention regarding the ICANN Evolution Group. And I don't think we're paying enough attention to the almost monthly that are coming out from the subsequent procedures at PDP Working Group on new gTLDs. A deal of effort into creating a monthly newsletter which is on GNSO website and on the working group wiki which covers not only we have done in the previous two weeks.

But what topics are coming up in the work tracks and this will be a portion and if you've done the five work tracks at the moment, the four work tracks. So that community and not just people who have declared themselves and been accepted as members of the PDP Working Group, but anybody in the community can either join into those calls or listen to the transcription and records. So it gives people, for example, the GAC fair knowledge and at least a [fort] notch warning if something were just concern to them is going to be discussed in the work tracks. So perhaps, Olivier, I'll swing you a direct e-mail about that last one that came out in the 7th of September. But it might be something that becomes the standard part of the ICANN Evolution meetings. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Inaudible] got it. I don't need –

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I would recommend something a little bit more direct than that. I would recommend identifying what the topics are that are coming up in a very targeted short and therefore on the first screen of the e-mail, make the information available at least on the ALAC and ALAC Announce mailing list or just ALAC Announce if you wish. Pointing someone to a document, 99% of people don't look at it. And if we're trying to encourage people to participate because a topic of interest to them is coming up, then I think we need to get that information out a much more direct way than simply assuming someone's going to read a monthly newsletter. So I would ask perhaps staff to consider how we can affect that and how we can make it happen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may, Cheryl, the newsletter is in several parts, so it might be relatively easy for staff to take an excerpt which is the part says what's coming up in each tracks and each the meeting dates and promulgate that separately if the people you think [are] interested and not able to read a whole one and a half pages, whole [babies]. I do want to have that manage in an actual conversation or PDP [present], that's all right.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think the issue is getting them to click not the reading once I get there. I ask staff for an action item to look at the last month's newsletter and propose to the ALT a format for an e-mail so we can take a look at and see if we might think it may be effective or not.

Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'll just need to say that the report of the ccNSO report actually does outline the whole issue. Just to remind people to read it.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we can find that where?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think if you click on the ccNSO, you'll get it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEPBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Cheryl mentioned just now the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group and dealing with it in the ICANN Evolution call. I was under the impression we were on [beginning] with the work tracks that were directly related to Work Stream 2. But at the same time, recently I've had some thoughts about having a call in the New gTLD Working Group that would have both an update from the CCT Review Team that Kaili and Mohamed that were on. No Kaili and Carlson, sorry, were on. And also the work of the PDP on the subsequent procedures.

I'm wondering whether a call within the next couple of weeks, so with ample time before we meet face to face in Abu Dhabi would be something of help with exactly the same formats. So updates and all of

the people who are involved in the different component parts of this work, so that we've got one location where you can point people and say, "Hey, you want a quick update in what's going on?" That's where it's happening. I don't know how you feel about it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me translate. Olivier has just volunteered to reach personally on his own volition resuscitate the gTLD Working Group pending finding, permanent leadership. Thank you, Olivier. We'll accept your offer.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: You might notice me that's what you were doing but that is what you did.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I asked you to realize that by the way. I mean I'm happy to share that meeting if you don't want to share it. That's no problem whatsoever. But yeah, we can launch a thing. It's just that I think it's worth doing and well, the onus, the point of the work is that we need to be up to date when we arrived in Abu Dhabi. I think that some real discussion will take place over there and maybe it would be good to have it one on the same page, sorry. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: No need to convince us, Olivier. We are convinced.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Perhaps should I start talking about how it should be done.

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Next, anyone else? I see no more hands other than Cheryl clapping some. Wish I agree. Thank you, Olivier for that. We'll now go on to the next item, At-Large review next steps.

There are not an awful lot of next steps other than the Gantt charts are almost finished. I'm not sure we're in a position to post what we have as of the last few minutes. If someone has it then you can post it just so everyone can see pretty lines but they will be finalized in the next few hours and distributed to the OEC. They will be merged into the document and revised document issued.

There is a meeting with the Organizational Effectiveness Committee on Thursday with myself, Cheryl and Holly. And I believe Heidi will be

attending the meeting also. This is a face-to-face Board meeting in Montevideo and we, of course, are not being flown down there, but we'll be on remotely.

There are some charts there. They are showing the four classes of implementations. One is ongoing and the other is – for some of the ongoing, there is a sort of a tick mark which says before that tick mark is some initial work that has to be done and after that it's business as usual. There is one that is class as already in progress which unfortunately in this chart doesn't start for several months. We will fix that, and a number of other ones that have various different lengths of time. It doesn't provide an awful lot of detail but the tech says we don't have an awful lot of detail. And we will be doing that assuming anyone ever approves or recommending.

Other than that, we don't know quite what the timing would be assuming the OEC approves what we are saying and passes it onto the Board. The Board will either act either in a Board meeting prior to Abu Dhabi, prior to the start of the formal meeting or at the Thursday meeting. So we don't know at this point and we'll not know until we get on the ground whether by the time we meet with the Board on Tuesday, whether it will be a [set and complete] that is all done and wrapped up or still to be debated and decided by the Board.

So stay tuned. At this point, we don't know at this point and we'll not know at the time when we have to finalize the Board questions. So we may well put conditional stay or conditional topic in or something like that. Anything else on the At-Large review? Holly or Cheryl or Heidi? I see Cheryl has her hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just wanted to note. I believe I've done this – you've instructed differently, that we'd be using the two, the simple form, the short little arrow one as well as these Gantt charts. So one sort of leads to the other, to the enunciated Gantt chart or for those who simply don't care. The simple little one it gives them an easy [TIFF] notes version to GNSO certainly use both forms and I would recommend we do include those in the [inaudible] documentation. But obviously that's just my view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I've actually recommend that we not do it for a number of reasons. Number one, it's exactly replicated in terms of the content with the chart that is showing at the top of the screen right now.

Number two, the arrows imply something one leads to the other. And in fact the titles we gave them stage 0, 1, 2, 3 imply they lead from one to the other and in fact they don't because almost of them started at the same time and concluded various times, and stage 0 in fact ends last.

So I think those charts are going to add more confusion than lead to clarity. So I'm suggesting that we in fact don't use those. We can debate that in the next few hours if you feel strongly. But the GNSO ones did call them phase 1, 2, 3 and they started in that order. And because there were things that already ongoing, things that were starting soon, [lower parties] that were starting later. And that's not exactly how we

organized it, so I don't think they make quite as much sense. And the information is virtually identical to the information on the top chart.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's the same as an executive summary on the top of the text document. It needs to be the same information. So I'm glad that it is. And if it's a measure of a simple text change of phase or stage to something that's [Kaili] indicates that they are different categories, so we can call them categories. It's a Cat 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, I would still prefer to get that way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: But in that case, we would do it in lieu of the four-line charts showing at the top of the screen now. Because it's exactly the same and would be physically immediately above it. Cheryl? If you're speaking, we can't hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Complicated with lag on Internet. Hopefully I'm being able to be heard now. My microphone shows it's on.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, we can hear you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hello.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We can hear you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good. Okay. Like I said, [lag in] the Internet. Yes, fine, it can be in lieu of the top one. Again, it's a graphic simplified version. It's a normal practice work area done but for the enormous amount of space the top section puts in with slightly greater detail in terms of specific [inaudible] line in the [inaudible]. I don't think it's over replicating, but it really doesn't matter. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I am happy to put them both in. We will redo those because the details on those were in fact wrong. But we will redo those and replicate them on top. Thank you. Next anything else to add on the review? And can we have an action item for Heidi or whoever did those to do another version of them?

Next item on our agenda is IGF Participation. We have two slots that were approved. One for Outreach and Engagement and one for ALAC. I am assuming we will ask the Outreach and Engagement Group to select

a person to represent them at the IGF meeting in Geneva. I am looking for suggestions on how we select who will go on behalf of the ALAC. This is not making a decision but I'd like suggestions and we will present the case to the ALAC after this. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I see that you don't consider the RALO workshops as activities of At-Large and the IGF?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, Tijani. I was not saying I do not consider them activities of At-Large. I was saying we were approved for two explicit people other than those associated with the activities. The two were conditional on RALO activities being approved. If we had not any RALO activities approved, we would not have these [too] either. So yes, I do consider those At-Large activities, but decision on who to send is a RALO issue at this point not an ALAC issue as far as I know because we have never decided that at the ALAC level before. So I was only talking about the two positions that we were funded for as the ALAC.

Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question, what is the timeline for coming up with two names and is there time to ask for suggestions on how somebody's selected?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm asking with this group right now for suggestions and how someone should be selected.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, but I'm just wondering what's the timeline for decision? I mean this [inaudible] put all –

ALAN GREENBERG: It is being planned at this moment and we are going to be as expected to provide some names to Constituency Travel relatively soon. We're talking weeks, not months. Days would be better.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I propose that the Selection Committee do the selection if there is applicant. I think that we should identify potential candidates because we may have people who [applied], they will not have added value. So we have to identify potential candidates and then the Selection Committee, their work can propose two names. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. You're saying the Selection Committee does both the ALAC one and the Outreach and Engagement?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. No, ALAC. I was referring about ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you said propose two names, you meant one?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, one. Excuse me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. And this will require ALAC ratification or do you believe we can just ask the ASC to make a recommendation to be implemented?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. This committee will make recommendation as normally and normally the recommendation are accepted. But if there is a big problem the Selection Committee make the recommendation always and ALAC can refuse this recommendation. But generally I think so far it is always accepted. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. There had been cases where the ALAC Selection Committee has simply been asked to make a decision. I was just asking for which you are preferring in this case. You said you preferred to go to the ALAC. Heidi, go ahead please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. It might be better or useful prior to selecting who goes to the IGF, to work with the subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement and determine what need there will be, what skillsets are going to be needed at the IGF and then at that point then, move ahead with the selection. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you proposing a timeline which will allow consultation with that committee? And then putting a call out and then a selection and then ALAC ratification?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a long sequence of events.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think we can fast track that. Again it makes more sense to me to make sure that we get the right people there. And that is moving forward. I know that internally, things are moving forward and I expect to be able to reach out to the subcommittee in Outreach and Engagement shortly and let them move ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Heidi, what is the particular skill that the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee have in the IGF so that they can identify the criteria or the skill needed? I think this is something that all the ALAC should do because all the ALAC have more or less the same skills based on [inaudible]. And perhaps some people have small skills, but it is not their problem. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point out that Outreach and Engagement is not the only purpose for attending IGF.

Anyone else want to speak up? Heidi is suggesting we ask Outreach and Engagement to propose the skills. Tijani has argued against it. Anyone else like to come out on this? Holly, go right ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I've said it in the chat I think we actually need some criteria. It's nice to have a Selection Committee but we really do need to know what we're expecting of both individuals to do. And I don't see any point of Selection Committee if we don't have some criteria [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Who is volunteering to put the criteria together? Maureen, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, exactly.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. The Outreach and Engagement has been discussing this issue, of course. Glen has actually set up a workspace in which people who are wanting to go or planning on going to the IGF or to indicate on the workspace what it is that they were actually planning on participating in and contributing to the IGF, as well as to the ALAC activities that [inaudible] has actually been working on. So I mean the [inaudible] group has already – there's some sort of criteria which we could pass on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't see any new hands. We have two people just – [do we] talk to the Outreach and Engagement. Heidi, can you draft a note for us to look at prior to me sending it or if you sent on my behalf?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other further comments on the IGF? Holly, new hand, old hand?

HOLLY RAICHE: Old hand, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next thing is a tentative meeting in Brussels on the first week of October discussing the GDPR. This is a roundtable session according to the message I forwarded to the ALAC. This will be a session that will be organized by the ICANN organization but ICANN staff would not participate in it. I find that a little bit hard to understand but that is what was said. The intent is to meet with representatives of the European community and the data protection officers. The group currently known as the – sorry. Yeah, sorry. And it's not clear when this meeting will be held. My understanding is the data commissioners are currently booked Monday through Wednesday which implies that it will be held in the latter part of the week.

The real question is who should be going to this meeting for At-Large? It clearly has implications of WHOIS and knowledge of WHOIS and the debates over WHOIS are relevant. On the other hand, it is an exclusively European issue from a point of view of data privacy which means it has great implications for all contracted parties regardless of where they are, but that's not our concern. It may have implications on users but that's not a 100% clear. And it may of course have implications on other groups like law enforcement and such if we no longer can use WHOIS after next may use WHOIS as we know it today.

So the question is how do we fund people, how do we select people? The meeting is open to anyone who chooses to go to it, so therefore if

funding is not an issue and particularly for people living in Brussels or living near and can provide their own funding, it's not an issue. But the question is who do we use on the two tickets we get from At-Large? I would like to think that if we send people from Europe, we could get more than two but I'm presuming that was already factored into the cost that is many of the cost will be quite low, and therefore do not expect to get two paid ones.

I might end up being there because I'm in Brussels at the beginning of the week for an RDS WHOIS Review Team meeting and I have asked that ICANN staff consider extending those trips for some or all of the Review Team members to participate. It's conceivable I will end up still being there but that's not clear and we shouldn't work on the assumption that I am. And I have no interest in being one of the funded members if I'm not there as part of the Review Team. I could, of course, choose to be there on my own expense for the hotel depending on what day it is held.

Any thoughts on how do we select the people? I'm particularly interested in Olivier's comments and Bastiaan's comments but anyone else is relevant – sorry, and Andrei's also. Olivier, go ahead. We have Olivier and Cheryl on the queue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

I believe this will take in Brussels and we do have someone already based in Brussels in the name of Christopher Wilkinson who is quite an expert on GDPR and has been covering these issues. That said, I don't believe that he needs to be funded since he's actually basically there. So

the two things, the funding on the one side but then the attendance on the other, is that a closed meeting or is that an open meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: It is an open meeting. I presumed people will have to say they're coming. At this point, we are told that if people fund themselves, they may participate. All I've seen is what you've seen in that message.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, okay. So I gather then that we will have probably time permitting for him, we'll have Christopher Wilkinson there. With regards to other experts in Europe on this topic, may I perhaps ask – I know that [Yrjö] has got a list of the experts in EURALO in this topic and perhaps we could consider sending at least just one of them if we have more than one slot.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Can you get hold of Christopher? Christopher's in Spain at the moment, I believe. Can you let him know about the existence of the meeting knowing that we don't know exactly when it will be held? Or for that matter, at this point, even if we are assuming that – we are hoping that it will be held sometime. If you can get hold of Christopher and let him know about it. What are the thoughts of – sorry, we have Cheryl's hands up. If to the extent Cheryl doesn't address it, what are the thoughts of finding someone who is very knowledgeable in WHOIS issues from somewhere else other than Europe and including them as one of the participants? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There was a lag as well which may or may not be an issue right now. I just wanted to – and I’m glad I’m following from Olivier on this – I just wanted to highly recommend that those people who are considerable experts [in an] area should be the ones that are supported. There will be nothing worse in sending somebody who just thinks it’s a really good idea so their profile or whatever.

Well, they’re up there [inaudible]. There is a great deal, quite a wealth of information and background material that would need to be not just prior reading but a strong working knowledge for anyone who’s going to get into this debate. So anybody who’s doing it under our name needs to perform an exemplary fashion.

So the expertise that Olivier’s offering up from Europe, I think is ideal. I don’t think we should worry too much about the funding aspects if it turns out that we can offer people who are there even on their own expense to travel. It might be nice to be able to offer them a small [inaudible]. So if they’re not having to buy their own lunch or whatever that that’s covered. And it may be equally appropriate if it’s a long time day and whether or not someone might need accommodation that might need to be looked at. But yeah, it’s going to be cheaper to bring people from Europe than not.

If you’re there, that would be excellent so I’d strongly encourage that to be looked at seriously. But most importantly if the quality of the people and the depth of knowledge on this particular and very specific topic is important.

To that end, you probably need to raise it with the rest of the ALAC because of course there are also people who have used – because companies that might not be in Europe but serve customer-base in Europe still have to consider that. So it may be appropriate to do what you've said and have at least one person from server field supported to be there as the meeting happens. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have a few thoughts. Olivier, go ahead first.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. So I mentioned Christopher Wilkinson. I think perhaps Carlton Samuels have been followed through the WHOIS and [she was] very closely might be another person that could be of interest. If we're going to have people funded to go there, you might as well get our experts worldwide. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, we will have people funded. We have two slots. Whether they are used just for a hotel and a meal or used for a \$4,000 plane fare, at this point there will be two slots. And thank you, Cheryl, for the comments and having me there on the other hand, I don't believe I should be one of those. I may consider funding myself for the hotel if ICANN will not, but that's a separate issue.

So what I'm hearing is we should try to get as many people there as possible within reason. Christopher should be one of them. We should look at funding for one person from Europe who otherwise would not

be there. And am not quite sure how to select it but I'll talk privately to our representatives from Europe on doing that selection. We'll send it as a note to the ALAC to follow on the last one on saying that the ALAC will consider funding someone outside of Europe as well. Or at least our recommendation is to do that.

We have Tijani and Bastiaan. Please go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. It doesn't mean I am against it, but I didn't understand why we should select one from Europe. Is it because we want the travel support be cheaper than people from other continents? I don't understand why it is only a [inaudible] reception or something like this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Tijani, it has nothing to do with cost whatsoever. It has to do with the GDPRs, the European regulation that is being translated into laws in European countries. Therefore that is where both the impact and the expertise in many cases comes.

Bastiaan, please go ahead.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS:

Thank you, Alan. I just want to explicitly say that I would want to go and I would not depend on funding. That is, assuming my schedule would permit this because we haven't got a date of yet. In following with discussions, to the best of my abilities and with regard to the GDPR, I

am somewhat familiar with it and am actually currently working on making my own employer's organization compliant and implementing policies in order to prepare ourselves for the GDPR. So I am somewhat knowledgeable and I'm still learning, so I definitely would want to be involved in this.

So again, not depending on funding and if there is place and my schedule permits, then I would want to go on behalf of At-Large. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Just to be clear for those who may not be fully familiar with the GDPR, the GDPR essentially says there's a whole bunch of rules and regulations associated with making personal information publicly available. There are rules associated with getting the person's prior approval, and the current rules we have associated with registration agreements probably do not follow those rules. Currently, all WHOIS information that is resident in the WHOIS database is made available to everyone, and there is no possibility of tiered access; that is, only some people can get hold of some parts of it. The protocol simply does not allow that.

On the other hand, law enforcement and the vast number of people who are involved in trying to control malware and other abuses of the Internet use WHOIS as part of a critical part of being able to manage the resources we have, as do intellectual property people trying to protect the intellectual property rights associated with domain names.

The simplistic solution to the GDPR is to shut down WHOIS completely, so that clearly protects privacy, but it doesn't address the other issues. The whole purpose of this exercise is to try to go forward with something which doesn't just shut down the complete WHOIS database in order to satisfy these regulations but allows access. So that's the really critical part. Going forward, we're not quite sure how that's going to map out.

All right. We'll do something on that with the ALAC coming out in the next day or so. Hopefully sometime this week we should know whether the meeting is on or not and when it is.

Holly, since the RDAP protocol was designed, we know what the RDAP protocol is designed to do, Holly, but it's not implemented today and it cannot be implemented today.

HOLLY RAICHE: There's a final working party that's going to meet, but as you and I both know, the requirement to allow gated access was not adopted because it wasn't policy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have a PDP that is ongoing right now. We cannot take actions outside of that PDP.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we can all dream in another world, but we're living in the real one.

All right. I thought this meeting was going to be a short one. We're now an hour and a quarter into the 90-minute meeting, and we haven't started ICANN60 yet. I will turn it over to Gisella right now for a shortened version of ICANN60 review. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. Sorry. Just unmuting. We'll try the shortened version for ICANN60. I'm going to share with you the drafted schedule that we do have so far. I have also put this in the – apologies, just I bring this up – ALT chat. They can bring this up on your screens because it may be easier to [inaudible] screen as it is on the Adobe Connect room.

One of the first things that I do need clarification on is whether all the cross-community sessions are going to be unconflicting. The last that was up on the list was that one of the cross-community sessions could eventually be used as an open slot, and that was the – sorry, I'm just bringing it up – one about jurisdiction. I'd like to know if there's any further update on that and also whether you can confirm that all the other cross-community sessions are to be unconflicting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. My recollection is I suggested there were two that could be conflicting, and that was specifically the jurisdiction and the standards for specific reviews. Both of those are issues that some people might want to go to, but I have a fair amount of difficulty saying that is what

recommending all of the 35/40 ALAC travelers go to. That's what I'd like to discuss very, very briefly now.

We've had pleas from Leon and from Rinalia, saying, "Allow people to go to the specific reviews." Cheryl has said she plans to go. I may well want to go. But I really don't think it's a topic that's going to be of great interest to the vast majority of people. I may be misreading this.

Can we have control over the screen so I can make it large enough to actually read?

Thank you. I'd like to open the floor to comments on that. Are there any other sessions that you believe we might be able to run against, or are people strongly disagreeing with having some At-Large sessions in competition with them?

I heard someone start to speak. I don't know who it was.

No one cares? Am I still online? We have Holly with her hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm just looking at the first day. It's in direct conflict with the RDS PDP. I think one of us, whether it's Bastiaan or myself, should be attending that one, frankly, because that is [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Holly, that's been standard practice that we acknowledge that you and perhaps others will be at the RDS one, and I and Cheryl will likely be at the gTLD one.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've been doing that now for at least three meetings.

The question is not on the PDP sessions, not on the GNSO sessions, but on the high interest topics. They start on the Monday. The question is: is there a strong argument for completely having no conflicts with the specific review standards or the jurisdiction discussion?

Now, we have at this point something like – I don't remember – 16 or 17 hours of sessions. We may well find that we can make these non-conflicting. But at this point, until we start the detailed scheduling, we don't want to commit to it. Likely what we will do is put working groups or something like that against them, but that remains to be seen.

All right. Not hearing any argument, then we'll proceed with that, Gisella. Go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. So I'm going to take the jurisdiction and operating standard ones as sessions where we can have working groups running parallel because at this stage I've got six working groups, and if we do keep them unconflicting, I would need to free up part of the 16.5 hours of ALAC working sessions that we do have because otherwise we're not going to be able to schedule these working groups. So unless I see

anything on the mailing list before later tonight, or tomorrow morning my time, I will be submitting the meeting forms.

At this first initial stage, I'll put in working groups for where I'll be facing working groups. Then I'll fine-tune it when I see the main schedule coming out as well. But over the next week I'll probably have to [face] the working groups themselves.

You may have seen that the –

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Gisella, it's Alan. Working groups are going to be in the same room as the ALAC meeting, correct?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Yes, correct. However, if I have two working groups overlapping, we will have use of a smaller room with no interpretation. So the working group that usually has interpretation will take priority in the main ALAC room. But, yes, there will be [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Understood, but that means, as we progress with the schedule, we can interchange ALAC working to At-Large working sessions and most working group meetings if necessary. So that gives us a fair amount of flexibility. Thank you. Let's go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Yes, confirmed. Again, once I've submitted the meeting forms, we'll still have a small window of time where I can change the [inaudible]. So I'm less concerned. I just need to make sure that, if we do and they think of having meetings running parallel, I can at least so far block off at least two rooms for us; again, one will be the main ALAC meeting room, and another room with be a secondary room.

We also have confirmation from Board operations that the ALAC and Board meeting is scheduled on Tuesday from 9:00 to 10:30. I have just requested from Board operations teams to confirm that we will be running through the coffee break because I will now need to allow additional transition time between meetings to not have anything back to back, and we won't even be in the ALAC room for that meeting.

As I've said, I've sent this through to everyone, so if you see anything that's looking abnormal on this schedule, please do let me know. The bottom part under the main schedule is just to show you the working groups we're trying to place, the RALO meetings, as well as any ad hoc meetings.

Alan, Leon, Beran, Heidi, and myself had a quick call. We're on the Scheduling Committee, and we have placed the ALT breakfast on Saturday, the 28th of October. I have already sent a note around. This is for the current ALT [pleas] and the liaisons. We will hopefully be scheduling a dinner on Friday, the 3rd of November, for the incoming ALT and liaisons, but nothing is yet confirmed. As we progress, you will be receiving e-mails for any ALT sessions, as these will not be on the public schedule.

We also have an ALT meeting scheduled on Saturday, the 4th of November. Again, this is for the incoming ALT and liaisons. This will not be on the public schedule, and you will have received an e-mail regarding this meeting. As we progress with the details and the meeting room, etc., I will be sending an e-mail out to the ALT list.

Are there any other comments that you see at this stage?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Don't think so. Just for people's information, on the ALT Strategy meeting on the closing Saturday, at this point everyone is planning to attend, with the exception of Bartlett Morgan, who unfortunately has a commitment in Barbados that he has to leave on Saturday to make. So it's rather unfortunate. We're going to have to live with it, though. I've talked to him about it, and there really is no choice.

Gisella, please go ahead with the next item.

GISELLA GRUBER:

We have a preview of – thank you – APRALO General Assembly and their activities. If I can hand it over maybe to Holly or to Maureen to give us a quick overview of where we stand, we do have the APRALO monthly meeting scheduled next Tuesday at 04:00. We had to move it from the original time this coming Thursday. We will have an exceptional meeting, which will be a 90-minute meeting, which will not only be the APRALO monthly meeting but also part of the Organizing Committee meeting, as now the APRALO monthly meeting does essentially deal with the upcoming General Assembly in Abu Dhabi.

So if I could hand it over to Maureen or to Holly, please, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Maureen is more up to date, as I've not been part of this for a week.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, not that much up to date, but, Gisella, you're correct. Our monthly meetings are becoming Organizing Committee meetings. The showcase and funding have basically been a key issue. ALSes – we're starting to get responses from them. I think they're pretty well organized. Satish has been in charge of the actual assembly meetings in conjunction with [inaudible], Gisella.

So I think that, yeah, it's starting to get together. I must admit I've been a little bit out of it over the last couple of weeks, but, yeah, I think Gisella is probably more informed about it than we are, actually. But I think at the next meeting we'll start to consolidate a few things. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to add that, basically, I've been working on the capacity building. We're having four sessions at lunchtime on capacity building that I've been working on and that will come together, I think. We can talk about that at the next APRALO meeting.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Holly, and thank you, Maureen. So, yes, we've got the APRALO activities in red on the schedule, as you can see in front of you. And you have scrolling rights. The showcase is also coming along nicely on the Wednesday evening from 6:30 to 8:00 P.M. All details are being worked on with the host. So more in the upcoming call next Tuesday, hopefully. APRALO is very organized, so we don't have much to worry about here. I think everything will be running like clockwork.

Unless there is anything else that you wish to bring up or you can see on the schedule, other elements may be just more of the groups we wish to meet with, the topics, we wish to discuss. That is more to populate the agenda of the ALAC working sessions.

Heidi, do you wish to add anything there?

ALAN GREENBERG: A question for Holly first. With the work you're doing on the capacity building, we are now scheduling pretty intensive capacity building at every GA. Are we using the material or at least the knowledge and passing it from one RALO to another or doing everything from scratch?

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, no. we're actually talking to each other.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Good answer. Back to Heidi.

Heidi, if you're talking –

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Gisella asked if you have anything else to add.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I don't, no. I've been listening, except for that last few seconds. So all is good.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Before we go onto social events, there's the issue of Evan's strategy session that he had provided. Evan had asked that it be a closed sessions so that people could speak freely without worries of either recrimination from other parts of ICANN or being quoted in the press. There has been a very strong and almost unanimous or perhaps unanimous feeling from those who have spoken up saying that it should not be a closed session and take the results of that, either in people not being as candid or being quoted. The implications of a closed sessions or both difficult to manage and may have repercussions, especially in light of the At-Large review that we really do not want to see.

Is there anyone who believes that is not the message I should give to Evan?

Olivier, is this your hand up in this subject or for something else?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Something else, Alan, with the previous topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, then. Let's stay on this one for the moment. I have a tick mark from Cheryl. Anyone else want to comment, or that is the message that I will give to Evan? I will be either excerpting or rephrasing the reasons that people have had for saying "do not have it closed," but I will be passing those off to him, either verbatim if you gave me permission or, for those who didn't, I will reword.

I see some tick marks. All right. Olivier, you said you had something on a previous item.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Alan. I was just going to suggest, when it comes down to the outreach activities in the region, that there be perhaps better coordination between the Outreach and Engagement Working Group and the region itself, and also with the regional VPs in charge of these because I've often found some frustration closer to the time of the meeting, where no one really knows what is going on in outreach and people just find out way too late about these activities. It's just frustrating. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will presume that those words are taken to heart.

Any further comments? We already have talked about social events, travel and logistics. I have heard no dire warnings that people are not

getting there on time or are having trouble with visas. Is that because we know there are no problems, or have we simply haven't had enough to update on that?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, it's Gisella, if I may. I'm in regular contact with Constituency Travel. We're working on all the APRALO ALSes. We're also working on our regular funded travelers. I have asked for a weekly update on all the travelers – that's close to 80 travelers – and so far, so good. I haven't had any issues that have been flagged. Now we're getting to the critical stages of the [inaudible], and I will make sure to keep you notified of any issues that are brought to my attention. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. For those who do not know, although I'm not sure who messages have gone to, because the incoming EURALO Secretariat was one of the travelers funded under the new policy travel initiative, we have to select another person. I have made a recommendation that has been accepted by the Chairs and I will be forwarding a message to the ALAC asking for a consensus call to approve that. We can put that in place.

Heidi, go right ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Alan. I just put into the chat the link to the ALAC Board questions wiki page. You will note that there are now two questions from the Board to the ALAC. Also, Olivier has put a comment on that

page for a suggested question on geo-regions to the Board. So, again, the deadline for the ALAC questions to the Board is coming up in the next few weeks. If you could please decide what those questions will be, that would be really useful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And although you didn't note it, I sent a message out yesterday to the ALAC, asking for input.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We are in sync. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Alan. Speaking about visas, since I've been in ICANN and even before, I have never, ever been told that I can't have a visa or my nationality is forbidden from having a visa to this country or the other. Never, never. I have ten-year U.S. visa. I have a three-year [inaudible] visa. So I don't have any problems with visas. Except this time. This time, the travel people tried to make a visa for me from Dubai because it is like this that it is done. The consulate here in Tunisia told me they don't give visas. You would have to go to Emirates Airlines and buy a ticket from them and take the visa from them. So I didn't understand anything. [inaudible] tried to have a visa for me from Dubai.

He didn't manage. He had been told that Tunisians are not given visas to the Emirates. It is very strange. So now –

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, for clarity, you don't need a visa or we will not allow you in?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, I need a visa and I am not allowed to have one. So now we are trying with Constituency Travel and people from Dubai – they already bought my ticket, and I am using this ticket to try to have a visa through this. I am not sure I will have it. So it is only to tell you that it is really frustrating for me that I have this problem from an Arab country, while in any other country I the world, they have never had this kind of problem. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. We do our best to spread the problems around. There's a very interesting open letter from someone from Mexico who was awarded a prize to be given today by the Internet Society in Los Angeles and telling the story of why they said he could not get a visa. The prime reason is they could not verify his address in the little village he lives in that doesn't have addresses and streets. The interesting part is he's getting the award for using the Internet in innovative ways to help connect people who are disenfranchised and disconnected. He was refused partially because he doesn't have a proper address. So life is interesting. Of the 25, only three of them have had visa problems. That's pretty good odds.

Anyway, any further comments on travel or logistics? Please, Gisella, keep an eye on it. Every year, every meeting, we have someone at the last moment who says, "I'm having problems," but no one ever told us about it ahead of time. To the extent that we can get positive acknowledgement that there are not problems as opposed to someone just not complaining yet, it would be good to hear about it.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. Just to say that I do – sorry about talking over you – get the list and that it's color-coded to make sure that there are no visa issues, etc. So I'm keeping a very close eye on all travelers. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just out of curiosity, was Tijani marked in color to say there is an issue?

GISELLA GRUBER: No, not yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: So much for being able to rely on the list. Sorry. I find humor in this. It's been a hard week already.

Anything else, anyone? Any Other Business?

Then seven minutes late, we'll call this meeting to an end. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry? Someone is speaking.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. This is Seun. Sorry. [inaudible] in relation to my visa issues. Can you follow up? Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Seun, I will do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And make sure Gisella knows about it, too.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Now we have two, and the number is rising.

Anything else? Any Other Business?

Then again I will call this meeting to an end. Thank you all for your participation. Thank you for letting it run over. Bye-bye.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you to all those who have participated. The meeting is now [inaudible].

SEUN OJEDEJI: Bye-bye. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Seun. Bye-bye. Looking forward to speaking to you all again.
Bye-bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]