GISELLA GRUBER:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to everyone on today's ALAC monthly call on Tuesday, the 17th of October, at 21:00 UTC. On today's call we have Seun Ojedeji, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Wafa Dahmani, Holly Raiche, Kalil Kan, Maureen Hilyard, Andrei Kolesnikov, Sebastien Bachollet, Alberto Soto, Leon Sanchez, Alan Greenberg, Javier Rua-Jovet. Apologies, just before I continue, if I could just remind everyone if you are on the audio feed bridge to please mute the speakers on your computer. Cheryl, I just muted your speaker.

I'll now continue with the roll call, we have Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjo Lansipuro, Barlett Morgan, Ricardo Holmquist, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Bram Fudzulani, Barrack Otieno, Vernatius Okwu Ezeama, Marita Moll, Jonathan Zuck. On the Spanish Channel we have Maritza Aguero, Alberto Soto. On the French Channel we have Gabriel Bombambo, Aicha Abbad and Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. Nobody currently on the Russian Channel.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco, Yesim Nazlar, Evin Erdogdu, and myself, Claudia [inaudible], and myself, Gisella Gruber. We have three language channels today: Spanish, French and Russian. Our Spanish Interpreters are Paula and Claudia. French Interpreters, Claire and Isabelle; and Russian Interpreters, Maya and Galina.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels, to also speak at a

---

reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. And if you do wish to mute your line during the call to avoid any interference, please press star six, and to unmute, please press star seven. Thank you very much and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Gisella. Item number two is adoption of the agenda; does anyone have any comments, question on the agenda or any other business to add?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I will presume the agenda is accepted as distributed and we'll go on to item number three on action items. Given that it has two minutes, I will presume there is nothing that requires attention of the ALAC and we'll go on directly to item number four, policy development, and turn the floor over to Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. This is Ariel speaking. We have two public comments in progress, one is the ICANN reserve funds public comment on rationale and target level, and that will close on the 30th of November. The other one is the draft PTI and IANA FY19 operating plans and budget; that will close on the 26th of November.

From yesterday the ALT meeting, they also discussed the public comment and there was an action item for me to list budget related sessions in ICANN60 for the reserve funds public comments, and I already did that on the WIKI pages. I don't know, Alan, how you want to discuss these two today?

ALAN GREENBERG: First of all, let's discuss them. The first is the draft PTI budget and the IANA fiscal year 19 operating plans and budgets. You'll notice this process starts way ahead of time because there's a new bylaw requirement that we feed the IANA budget into the ICANN budget, but there will be several steps ahead of time so it comes several months before the ICANN budget is even proposed. Ricardo has suggested that he is willing to look at submitting a comment.

First, we need to decide definitively whether we need a comment and I'm presuming as a first step, Ricardo, we'll review the documents and make suggestions as to whether he believes a comment is necessary and solicit other input. Is there anyone on the call today who has done sufficient work or has sufficient knowledge of this item, that you would care to venture a suggestion as to whether this is something we may need to comment on or may need to step back and not?

Ricardo, please go ahead. I will note that we do have a liaison on the customer standing committee for PTI and we probably should solicit some input from Mohamed on this particular item, but Ricardo, please.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Hello, can you hear me? It's Ricardo Holmquist for the records.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you.

EN

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I read the document. I didn't see anything wrong on the wording of the document, but at the end there are some numbers and the numbers do not match, they don't add [inaudible]. This is the thing that is wrong in the document, it's about that and the numbers do not match. That is the only thing I find out there.

ALAN BREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much. That's interesting. If I could ask staff to put Ricardo in touch with Mohamed as a first phase, either in touch with Mohamed or in touch with a staff person responsible for this public comment and see if we can get clarification on the issue that Ricardo has identified.

As much as we can use a public comment to identify errors in the document, if we can clear them up ahead of time that makes it even better. If I could ask for some staff help on that and we'll move forward. Thank you, Ricardo, for doing that. Anyone else have any insight? Alberto, please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto for the record. I am listening in the meetings that mention about paying part of the communication structure using these funds and some of the meetings said that the liaisons are not paid by the ICANN, and particularly one item that was mentioned that are the EXP, I don't know who pays for that, so ICANN would pay for that as well? Thank you.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I'm completely out of my depth at this point. I'm not sure what items you're talking about. If you can elaborate, or perhaps we can take this offline.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto for the record. Okay, we will do it offline, Alan. I will send you an email.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. On the second item, and that is on the reserve, there was a brief discussion on the ALT meeting yesterday; the general consensus was we probably want to comment because this is a very substantive issue with regard to ICANN, and as budgets potentially go down or revenue goes down, it's being predicted at this point that the lack of a reserve or a reserve is important, we don't know at this point whether there will be any auction funds that will be allocated.

My gut feeling is the tone of the participants in the auction CCWG is such that there may not be auction funds, even though it was something that the board requested that we consider, but that remains to be seen.

As Ariel pointed out, we have identified a number of sessions related to budget at the ICANN60 meeting; anyone who is considering volunteering to write this comment really needs to make sure that they are aware of all the issues and participates either locally or remotely in those budget related session at ICANN60.

EN

So I think we'll leave it on the table right now, we have a fair amount of time to do the comment, but as people are considering whether they want to look at it or not, make sure that they're up to date on all the issues is quite critical.

LEON SANCHEZ: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, who is that?

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon, go ahead, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. I would like to ask a question to the ALAC as to what is our position in regards to pushing in the auction for CCWG? Perhaps some portion of those auction proceeds allocated to guarantee the budget both for PTI and ICANN the organization. What are your thoughts on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think the ALAC has taken a position on that and that's something that if we can find a few minutes we perhaps should discuss in Abu

EN

Dhabi. Heidi, if I ask you to take note of that, if we can find a little bit of time.

Personally, I have taken a very strong position from the very beginning that I believe this should be something that we should consider and do. I would not want to see a significant percentage of the auction funds devoted to that, but if we do have $235,000,000 I would consider it quite reasonable to put $40,000,000, $50,000,000, $60,000,000 maybe perhaps as high as that into the reserve because I think ICANN will be in a far more stable position if we have that.

And from a very personal point of view from the point of view of At-Large, operational funding, if we don't get a bulk infusion of money, then we are going to have to take a significant part of operational revenue each year and put it into the reserve to build it; and if we can do that, a significant amount in one fell swoop, then I think that takes a lot of the pressure off the operational budget as well.

I strongly support it, but the ALAC has not had a formal discussion nor have the five members appointed by the ALAC on the CCWG had that discussion. I don't think we have enough time to do that today but that would be a good item if we can squeeze it in somewhere in Abu Dhabi. Thank you for mentioning it, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: I did ask Ariel to add a new item onto the policy page and that is ICANN forecasts the upcoming public comments once we expect to start in the near future, and I've asked Ariel to take the ones that we're expecting within a month and add them so that we can we start doing a little bit of advance planning and to the extent we have people who are in a position to make comments on these things, to start working on them and volunteer ahead of time.

We have three particular ones that are associated with the CCWG accountability and our normal practice is we try not to have the people write the comments who are very active participants, but these are all quite important areas going forward and we really do want to start considering these, and the people who volunteer really should be up to date on what's going on in this.

The last one is something that we've been focusing on for quite a while now and we'll continue in Abu Dhabi, and that's the CCT review team, our final report. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Alan. Sebastien Bachollet for the record. First of all, I understand that we don't have time to discuss the issue we are discussing; may I ask you humbly not to give your point of view if we are not able to give other points of view.

Second point is that, if you take all the recommendations going outside of the CCWG Workstream 2, we may have two more, one about transparency and another one about -- I'll have to check which one, but I guess it'll be better to have the full list also of the possible

recommendations from the CCWG that we will have to comment after Abu Dhabi. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien, and I'll take note of the first item. On the second one, I did ask Ariel to take extract from the formal ICANN list any ones that had an expected date within a month. I'm assuming they were not listed there; if they were listed there and are not on this sub-list, then we have a small error, but I'm presuming the former. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. I'm going to put the link in the chat because it's a very long list and the dates don't really match. For example, some of the upcoming public comments are already open and then some just have an August date but still not published. It's not very clear about this page and I do know my policy colleagues are working on the upcoming public comment and there will be some improvements to that.

I'm not sure what will be the best way to get the most accurate list, but it seems the dates don't really match. The ones that I picked out, usually have the dates listed in November; we're October, so that's the one I listed here, otherwise it will be a very, very long list.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To the extent possible, you should -- obviously, if it has the date of August and it wasn't published yet, then it should be included in the list as forthcoming. But I understand, because of the CCWG, the list

right now is probably prohibitively long, but we should err on the side of mentioning something which may take two months, see if it's already late, as opposed to missing one, just going forward. This is something that just came up yesterday afternoon, so I think we have to have an allowance for some level of error.

Any further comments on policy discussions? Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Just to say that as we know what will come out I guess with 99% of substitute from the CCW after our meeting tomorrow or after Abu Dhabi, we know that there will be two other items, it's why I think even if it's not written on the comment page, it's better for us to have it as a reminder. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Feel free to pass your wisdom onto Ariel as we publish these lists; we can only ask so much. Holly, go right ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, Alan. Just a question, and maybe it's something we can discuss in Abu Dhabi, what will be the process once we start getting these lists? I'm assuming we'll have time so that people can be allocated to go away and discuss, think about, etc. It's going to mean either it's a very short policy discussion on the ALAC because everybody will have done the work, or we can use much more time on the ALAC call?

I'm just wondering, it's a lot more work, it's probably going to be more productive, but how do we fit it in? Maybe that's just an issue that we can discuss in Abu Dhabi.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have an issue on the agenda in Abu Dhabi on how do we select what to comment on, how do we select the people and how do we make sure we get input. We're not going to solve all the problems there but we will be discussing it because clearly, it's something that we have not done as well as we should have given how late some of the comments are and how long it takes to get off the ground with starting to draft a comment. It is something we'll we discussing and hopefully we will end up in a batter position afterwards than we are right now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon again. Another issue that we might want to keep an eye on is the correspondence between the SSAC and the board in regards to the SSR2.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is something that will be on the agenda in Abu Dhabi.

LEON SANCHEZ: Excellent, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further issues on policy? Then we'll go onto item number five and a report on ALS and individual members, and I presume Evan will be taking this one.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you, Alan. Hello, everyone. I'll be brief. I've updated the agenda, so it's a bit longer because now, as per the last meeting's request, we're tracking individual members as well. We currently, in terms or ALSes, have a few that we're now waiting for original advice for. One for EURALO, and one for APRALO, and three AFRALO, and we've also received feedback from a regional VP for the Africa region, so we're processing a few more applications for AFRALO, so those should be coming through soon for regional feedback.

Regarding the individuals, we now have a snapshot on the agenda, so our current count is 64 plus four observers, and most of you may be aware that AFRALO has opened now an individual membership application form, so they are currently processing a few AFRALO individual member applications, as well as a couple from APRALO. That's it for me. Thanks so much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll ask for offline feedback on the format that we're using right now. We are presenting all of this information inline and it takes up a full page at the top of the agenda. If we just put a link to it somewhere else, I suspect no one would ever look at it, or at least not many people would look at it.

I'm just wondering if we can get offline feedback, do we keep this kind of format, do we put a link or do we put the actual detail information perhaps at the bottom of the agenda where, you know, we can look at the agenda and get a cleaner version of it without a page of intermediate data. Kaili, please go ahead.

KAILI KAN: Thank you, Alan. Just about an [inaudible] member of ALSes, recently we just have to say [inaudible] for 80 RALOs we have 52 ALSes instead of 53. I didn't hear or recognize this is something [inaudible] and also recently putting together a [inaudible] of APRALO [inaudible]. There has been a tendency of accusations [inaudible], so at least after maybe ICANN60 [inaudible] if we look into and if any mistakes [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Kaili. I presume staff will work with you or other APRALO people to make sure the numbers are in fact correct and everyone is working with the same list. Any other comments?

EN

Then we will go on to agenda item number six, which is RALO reports from liaisons, RALO's or any other groups that feel we need to be updated. Reports normally are presented electronically on the WIKI, but if anyone has anything they want to bring to the attention of this group, please do so now. Yrjo, please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. On the liaisons page in the WIKI, there's a report of the preparatory meeting we had on the 6th of October between ALAC leaderships to prepare for the joint meeting in Abu Dhabi. There's one point up here, I'd liketo say there was a little discussion, we completely agreed on the fact that the information coming from ICANN to the constituencies, to the community is not conducive to informed participation on an equal basis from all communities.

We decided to try to do something together to solve this problem and what you will find on the report page is a draft statement on informed participation; a draft statement might be made by both, and this not a final form in any way, it's rather a basis for a discussion on this between the GAC and ALAC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Yrjo. To be clear, in the discussion between leadership of the GAC and the ALAC, we did discuss whether we could issue such a statement out of Abu Dhabi, presumably within the GAC communiqué on a separate document, but the same wording from ALAC. The other alternative, depending to what extent we got the time to work jointly in Abu Dhabi, is do something perhaps a week or two

weeks later, once we've had time to finalize it and approve it in both groups.

It's not clear how we're going to go forward, but it's a problem that both of us have, in that both of us have lots of people who might be interested but the difficultly of understanding what ICANN distributes is sometimes enough of an impediment that we just don't act at all. It's an interesting concept going forward. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Alan. Hopefully, I can be said all right. Just from the GNSO liaison perspective, as I also informed the ALAC leadership team at the last meeting of the GNSO council, the GNSO council saw fit to confirm me as in appointed co-chair of the subsequent procedures for new gTLD's CDP working group. This was in preparation for Avery, who the current co-chair with Jeff Neuman, who move on to her board roll. So we were to operate as a three-person leadership team between now and in to Abu Dhabi.

However, since then, Avery has found that the prepare for her board requirement is becoming pretty full and she has now officially stepped down, so I'm now currently the only other co-chair with Jeff Neuman. To that end, the only other thing I wanted to just mention while I had the microphone is my pleasure to say that Work Track 5, the work track under that particular PDP process looking at the use of country and territory names, the geographic names, is beginning to get itself of the ground.

We've had one meeting of the leadership team, the co-leads have been provided from the ccNSO, the GNSO, the ALAC and the GAC, and we are planning to have a session, a quite long block session on that topic in Abu Dhabi. Just to that point, with the geographic names, I would like to also let you all know, so you can prepare your regions, that there will very shortly be a call for participants and members. This is a fresh call for people to join the Work Track 5 as one of the workstreams within that PDP process. Perhaps the regional leads would like to watch that space and prepare their membership for consideration to join us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I'll point out that in an earlier discussion, although membership in this Workstream 5, Work Track 5, will be voluntary, that is anyone can put their hand up and say they want to be a member. There was a suggestion that the ALAC appoint five people who will be effectively commit to being obliged to attend the meetings and interact with their regions so we make sure that we do have both active involvement and regional involvement over and above anybody else who might put their hand.

That is something that we will be discussing once the call comes out. But there was a strong indication or feeling that we should do that in addition to the regular volunteering to be a member. Any further comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, just on that, I would whole heartedly support that action by the ALAC. In this way you can have a lower case liaison back to the ALAC and it also means that we will have a more solid and predictable active participation, which is something I think is vitally important for this particular topic.

But I will also note that it is likely under the terms of reference for this work track that we will never be calling on such a thing as a vote as we saw as a potential in the CCWG on accountability and also the IANA transition. This a sub-track or work track of a larger PDP process, so you wouldn't be evoking voting rights on the representatives, but I think the roll of the representative as lower-case liaison would be vital and would be welcomed. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I hope I didn't imply anything other than that. Although, I do note in earlier discussions there was a belief at one point that we might do something like that, the group might do something like that, but that was made clear that it was knocked off several weeks ago or several months ago I think. Any further comments from any liaisons or anyone else who wants to highlight a report?

If not, then we'll go onto the first substantive item for discussion on our agenda. We have a guest who I believe is with us, that is Mark Carvel, who is the United Kingdom representative to the governmental advisory committee and who has drafted a paper that I presume will be presented during the GAC meeting. I think this is a draft, looking at

community based gTLD applications and the GAC advice at how to proceed with respect to them.

Obviously, if this is something that we strongly support without any specific disagreement, then it's something we may want to explicitly support in Abu Dhabi. If it comes to that stage or if we have disagreements over some parts, we may want to look at it and consider what we want to do if it's different. I'll turn the floor over to Mark.

MARK CARVEL: Thanks very much, and I appreciate very much the opportunity to join you on your meeting and to introduce this topic. If we put it in the context of where we are in ICANN and expansion of the domain name system, as we generally do expect now there will be another process for expanding the domain name system via [inaudible] or some policy approach like that to invite more applications for generic top level domains. There will be a need to address some of the problems and deficiencies that were identified in the current round.

There are a wide range of issues, the community based applications experience is just one. If we look at how the round performed in ensuring effective diversity, both of type and geographical origin of gTLD's, there were clearly some major failures. And we, and the GAC, and you yourselves, and ALAC have commented on these in recent years.

The GAC will approach the process for pairing a new round, and in particular engaging in the subsequent procedures EDP, with a view to mooting corrections of problems and deficiencies that were

experienced and that have been widely commented on and argued about.

There's going to be a lot of argument, no doubt about it, and community based applications will be sure enough one of the areas where there will be arguments, there will be push and shove, and we'll have to see how the interaction amongst stakeholders will proceed, but GAC is very cognoscente of some of the problems that undermined the conceptual objectives that the GNSO set out in the very early days.

There was a place in this process for dealing with the special requirements of communities. Communities that wanted to express themselves through having their own top-level domain for whatever purpose, to foster a sense of unity, to create a voice for themselves in the growing social and economic digital environment and so on. That vision was a very laudable one and it was very well supported across the community.

There might have well been arguments about how such special treatment might be developed, but the resulting process of giving the opportunity for these types of applications to be prioritized was a commendable objective and there was general agreement that we can start some kind of process that would implement such prioritization, that particular applicants who felt themselves to be a community would seek to take advantage of. That was the objective, that aim, that was a vision that would enhance the expansion of the domain name system.

There hasn't been much discussion about that, but the GAC has not had the opportunity really to go back to basics and decide how to define

what a community should be and what the public interest benefits of communities should be. We haven't done that. We wanted to go with the concept and we supported the applicant guide book and the processes that were set out in the guide book. We sat back and then saw what happened, and progressively a number of problems started to emerge.

A number of GAC representatives were receiving representations and there were some very high-profile cases, but before I come on to that, perhaps I'll just stop at this point about the concept and the aims and the public interest benefits. How we might go back to that and look at how we could define these more accurately. I wonder if people on the call have any comments on that.

This issue of how a community would be defined and what the benefits for applicants who would expect to benefit from prioritization, what those benefits would be; that deficiency or that lack of precision and clarity was identified both the ombudsman and also by the council of Europe who conducted, as I'm sure you all know, their own independent analysis of all the problems relating to community based applications.

I'll stop at that point and see if anybody has any particular comments about that particular part of this issue, the conceptual framework setting if you like and the rational for prioritization.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Mark. Holly has her hand up, but perhaps it's worth spending one minute ahead of time for people on this call who

EN

are not familiar with what the ground rules were in the first round, it may be worth repeating them because I think that frames the discussion of how to go forward. The applicant guidebook defined a concept of a community application and gave some rules as to how one could recognize a community. If no one else applied for the same string, then you simply were granted a community TLD according to the rules without any problem and you were never evaluated under the criteria.

However, if someone else applied for a standard non-community TLD, with the same string, normally if multiple people applied they either had to work it out among themselves, have an auction or something. If there was a community applicant among the identical strings, and if you passed the criteria, then you got the TLD, you simply took complete precedence over the non-community applications, and because you could get precedence and get ahead of your competitors in a sense, that criteria were sent very stringently and many people think too stringently. That's the framework that we're having this discussion at all. Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's really a process thing. I would like to go back to the paper that EU did which was very useful, the ombudsmen report, and identify exactly the sort of issues that Alan has pointed to and that Mark has pointed to, how do we define, what kind of evidence based, are there other issues such as are there simply a lack of awareness, a lack of resources, and yes, it would be a very useful thing, but I think the place to start is to back and review the cases and the papers, and see what's lacking or

what was contentious and then more forward. I think it's a great idea. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan, and thank you, Mark. Just a question, do we have any work done on who participated and from which constituency they came from as the one who defines a specific part of the application guidebook? I have the impression that it could be very useful to know why it's so complicated to get an application for a community and I guess it was done on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure to what extend there is a history of that. Because anyone who was deemed to be a community got precedence, absolute precedence over anyone else who was not a community, they set the bar pretty high to make sure it wasn't gained, that people didn't pretend to be a community just to get ahead of their competitors and that's where it ended up being.

I will point out just very quickly that we are looking in the PDP at other things and it's conceivable that if you are a community we may end up saying the price you pay is different and therefore there may be a benefit or implications of being a community even if there's no competition, and that's something that's not been decided yet. Mark, back to you.

MARK CARVEL: Thanks very much, and thank you for those comments and questions, Holly and Sebastien. I think you are hitting on a raft of issues with regard to implementation and some of those issues, for example people's understanding of who would eligible for prioritization in the event of a contention of competition from a wholly commercially based application, information about who would benefit was probably not clearly understood and the high bar that Alan has just recounted was another issue.

Some potential community based applications who would be defined as such decided no, they wouldn't be able to reach that high score in order to become recognized as a community based application, so there was a sort of deterrence element if you like, from the word go. Getting that sort of scoring criteria and the bar right was clearly an issue that needs now to be looked at again if such a process for evaluation is reinstituted in the next process.

There are a number of problems and some of this goes back to the early stages, and I haven't looked at the early history either; I don't know if its fully documented, but if the PDP can really go back to basics and look at the concept, make clear what exactly is the benefit to be achieved in terms of defining what is a community and how they should actually be treated in a preferential manner, and then progress the process for reviewing the mechanics of prioritization and evaluation from that point onwards, it would be a great help. And certainly looking at the experience of those applications that did see to take advantage of the

priority evaluation will be invaluable because there were a lot of inconsistencies and these are quite well documented.

The counts of Europe experts who looked at this did a pretty thorough job in looking at the comparative experiences and identifying where there are inconstancies, and we saw this in quite a wide range of applications. Some of the sports ones for example, applications from sports bodies, federations representing athletes and sports clubs and so on, they were treated quite differently for no readily understandable reason. The experience with these inconstancies will need to be taken into account to prevent such a reoccurrence which started to bring the whole process into disrepute.

If we look at how the implementation of the community priority evaluation process was conducted, that's where the GAC really started to feel that this thing was not working out, that there were a number of problems, applications were becoming bogged down, protracted, and many of the applicants of course had very low resource base from which to work and they were being also frustrated about their expected time tables.

I particularly remember the .rugby case, they wanted to get their top-level domain up and running, ready for the World Cup and that didn't happen because it got progressively bogged down by the competing applicants. Frustrating resolution of the community based application, getting final delegation. Time was passing and they weren't passed all their -- this is the International Rugby Board -- went way past their time line in terms of getting operational, getting the domain up and running ahead of the World Cup.

There were problems like that which, again, brought the whole process into some disarray and frustrated many of the applications' objectives and expectations were not realized. I set out in the paper the progressive sets of advice that the GAC made to the board recording the apparent deficiencies in the process that were undermining the commitment to prioritize community based applications and we continued to make the case for corrections to be instituted, but of course that might have been difficult as the overall application process progressed, so we could only look really to highlight these problems with a view to instituting corrections with a further application round. So that's the bases of the paper.

As you said, Alan, I think at the beginning, it is a final draft. We were invited to provide this to the PDP working group and we will submit that after some further internal discussion in the GAC, and it will probably be done during the Abu Dhabi meeting as you say, and then we'll invite comments from other stakeholder communities, including yourselves of course on this whole issue, as we start to engage fully in the PDP on the treatment of community based applications. I'll stop there for any further questions and comments and then get back into Adobe. I just dropped out, actually; well, my screen's gone down anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Thank you, Mark. We do have a speaker queue and we do have a little bit more time to spend on this subject, not too much. I'll first turn it over to our first speaker, Olivier.

EN

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Thanks for this summary, Mark. I find this to be particularly interesting.   One thing that you mentioned is the inconstancy in the evaluation that seems to have happened. The ALAC is on record for having pointed out or more like criticized the choice of the evaluator being the columnist intelligence unit as an evaluator that did not have or did not appear to have the knowledge nor the experience to be able to make such judgment.

The question I wanted to ask was whether there was any evaluation on whether the evaluator was the correct organization for the job. I think that in the ALAC statement, which I'm sure we can find somehow in our archive, we deplored the lack of actual community involvement. It sometimes takes a community to define a community or to find a community, and without a community being involved with it, it does make it a bit difficult.   And so I wonder whether there's been any looking into this?

MARK CARVEL: Thank you, Olivier. I'm not aware that that has actually been looked at. It's not an issue that we in the GAC have picked up on, but I think it's a very valid point.   There was criticism of the performance of the evaluator of the EIU and maybe they were not the right entity to undertake this kind of work. I think that is a factor to put into the PDP consideration. I would agree on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm next in the queue, two very brief comments. Number one is, we talk about the public interest in ICANN a lot; the vast

majority of what we seem to do seems to be focused on business and I think we need to note that by saying community applications had precedence over regular gTLD's we were essentially saying that a community TLD is better for the world then yet another potentially for profit and non-community TLD.

I think ICANN has to get a lot of credit for having the nerve to that and the implementation clearly was somewhat flawed. I'm not sure to what extent we can say any given unit understands communities or not since communities come in a lot of different forms. The inconstancy in which the terms were interpreted was striking however in some cases, where some groups with a relatively small representation of the world's X's were deemed to be a community and other ones were deemed to not to be a community cause they didn't have enough of the world's X's, where the numbers were not necessarily significantly different.

Clearly, we need to do it better going forward but we need to also make sure that we don't lose the concept which was a really admirable one and one that's rather unusual in ICANN, sadly. Sebastien, and then Dave.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. [Inaudible] what Mark said at the beginning of his intervention that there were some applicants who were waiting to go as a community and not to go because the bar was too high, and I would like to say that we asked together some data, and one of them could be who was the one who competes with applicants from a community who were the other applicants and to see their competitors. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Mark, for the summary. My question leads to, we talked about the community based gTLD application from the challenge regarding how communities will recognize; has there been any discussion within the GAC as to how the definition of communities as it related to communities to object and that's regarding the community objection process by which a community can object to a gTLD application and the challenges that came from that process.

                             The community had to be a clearly [inaudible] community, it had to be substantial opposition from the community and so forth, and the challenges rarely came from -- proving that you had standing to object from a community standpoint. Has there been any discussion? Because in my mind it's kind of related. Thanks.

MARK CARVEL: Dev, thank you. Well actually, no, I don't recall the GAC having engaged on that particular issue. It was a very important issue. The counts of Europe experts did look into this and undertake some analysis. I think it's another issue that we need to raise in the context of the PDP, that's certainly true. This whole area of definition eligibility needs to be looked at, as I said at the beginning.

                             One can talk about a community of individuals with some kind of shared interest or objectives that look to engaging online through their own

top-level domain with a sense of unity and purpose or some common objective or common activity, a kind of corporative type of basis for coming together. We can explore how we can refine such a definition so that it creates predictability and allows the kind of accountability that you're referring to in terms of lockers for an objection and so on. This is work to be done I think.

The counts of Europe experts identified this as something that needed to be looked at, and likewise I think ombudsmen did as well. I think we should all get together as a stakeholder community to reinforce the concept and rationale for identifying communities and what preference they would be entitled to, through ensuring that the definitions and predictability arising from such definitions are robust, coherent, and provide certainty and predictability.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Mark. We have about two or three more minutes. I see Yrjo has his hand up, but if you have anything else you want to do in presenting the paper prior to any other questions, then please do, and if we have time we will go to Yrjo. Mark?

MARK CARVEL: Sorry, yeah. I don't have anything really further to say. Over to Yrjo to speak next. Perhaps I'll just finish by an open invitation for people to look at the paper, tell me what they think works well in the paper, what they think is missing and any corrections and so on. I welcome any contributions on all those lines.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Mark. I'll be making a similar invitation in a moment once Yrjo is finished, but Yrjo, please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan, and thank you, Mark, for coming to this meeting. This will be on the agenda of the joint ALAC/GAC meeting Abu Dhabi as well, and also, I hope that perhaps interested members from both bodies could perhaps continue this discussion about definitions over a cup of coffee if we find time. Thank you again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Yrjo. We hope to -- we're still working on the detailed agendas for Abu Dhabi -- we hope to have a session on preparation for the joint ALAC/GAC meeting, and on the assumption that we do have that time, this will be one of the items.

In addition to letting Mark know if you think he has something to change, then please, do everyone read the paper and do gather your ideas because we will be trying to see if there's any coherence in the ALAC position and how it relates to this GAC paper. That's the homework in preparation for our meeting next month or later this month.

The next item on the agenda is the At-Large review update. I will give a very brief summary and then open the floor if Holly or Cheryl have any comments.

MARK CARVEL: Alan, it's Mark speaking. I'll drop out now and with a big thank you to everybody for…

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Mark. You're welcome to continue to listen to the intrigue of the At-Large review, but on the other hand you may be smart enough to leave.

MARK CARVEL: I'll look for a condensed report of your [inaudible] ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Glad to give one.

MARK CARVEL: Many thanks, I'll say goodbye for now then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks very much. You will all recall that the external reviewer and the ALAC did do a brief presentation for the organizational effectiveness committee. They decided that although the standard practice is to forward the -- assuming they agreed with the AC or SO's comments -- to forward them to the board for approval and the board would instruct that they be implemented. In effect, we did not really accept any of the

recommendations in total, we accepted eight of the them with some 'buts' added on to it.

The OAC was in a rather awkward position that they couldn't really simply say implement, they have decided to ask -- and this is a path never followed before -- they have decided to ask for a summary, essentially a roadmap that compares the issues raised with what the ALAC is proposing to implement, essentially bypassing the recommendations. They have asked MSSI to create such a roadmap, such a mapping of the two parts of it and the OAC will consider it. We are currently in discussion with MSSI as to what extent the ALAC and ALAC working party see this roadmap prior to the OAC considering it.

I have made my personal statement to them, and that was supported yesterday on the ALT meeting by Cheryl and Holly, that it is completely unreasonable for the OAC to consider any document, no matter how preliminary about At-Large without At-Large or parts of At-Large having even seen it ahead of time, and that's where we stand right now. Holly or Cheryl, Olivier has his hand up, I will give the floor to Holly or Cheryl if they have anything to say at this point first.

HOLLY RAICHE: First of all, thank you Alan, you've pretty well summed up where we're up to. The comment I would make in addition is it means that the timeframe where we had originally hoped that it would be this board, with this board's experience of the whole review process to make the final call, that's now blown out, and in fact now we've got the timetable looks as if the whole matter is going to the new board, and I have to say

EN

that's a personal disappointment. And I'm also personally disappointed that the development of the document that we have not seen and not been involved in. That's all, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Holly. Yes, I did neglect to mention that, that wasn't intentional. The current target is for the document to go to the OAC in the end of November, well after Abu Dhabi, and it is not yet decided at this point that we will not see it. That was simply the state of events the last time an email was created and I haven't looked at email in the last four hours, so it may have changed since then. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. One comment and one question. First commenting wise, when it comes down to transparency, I recall the board being committed to share their input documents and especially the briefings that are done by ICANN staff towards the board so that the community would know how decisions were arrived at or at least what was the information that the board had in their hands to make their decisions. Does that not apply for this specific process?

Because I recall this having been a commitment made by the board after one incident when the board made the decision on information that was blatantly false, that was going totally against the actual advice that was give. That's one question.

The second question is, do we have any rational, have we been given any rational for the board having to make its decision on a briefing

EN

document written by staff rather than the structural improvement committee making its decision on staff paper rather than making it on the paper that we've drafted?

A:AN GREENBERG: I can address both of those, to some extent anyway.   Briefing documents, although I'm not sure it applies to briefing documents given to every committee, briefing documents tend to be made available after the fact, not ahead of time.

However, the incident you referred to is in my mind among others and I'm well aware of it, and that's one of the reasons that we believe there should be transparency in this case.   In terms of who writes it, I believe the OEC made a rather inspired decision to say discard the recommendations or do not factor in the recommendations but try to do something on basics.   However, you will recall that the reviewers incorrectly viewed the last review and said that the Westlake review was discarded and the ALAC created a new one in its place.

In fact, the group that created the new one was a board committee not the ALAC, but it's relevant in this case because the whole process says it should be an external body that does it.   Well, the external report is deemed to be not acceptable in this point, but it would not be acceptable for the ALAC to write a replacement.   I think it's quite reasonable that staff tries to formulate this, but I don't believe it's reasonable that it be presented to a board committee without us looking, at least having a chance to comment on it, if not edit it.   Any further comments?

This is in a state of flux, it's likely to change by tomorrow and there's a fair amount, as you can tell from Holly and my comments and Olivier's, a fair amount of angst and concern over how this is proceeding, and a comment was made when we discussed this yesterday on the ALT and I think I will quote verbatim, "Where is the transparency in this?" And that is indeed a great question and we're trying to make sure there is some level of transparency.

Seeing no further hands, I will go on to the next item. You will recall that the special budget request this year, in addition to approving several IGF workshops, which included travel funds for a number of people, we also got approval for an ALAC request that we provide funds for some number of people not directly associated with projects, and perhaps to my surprise, that was accepted.

The request was phrased in a sense that we wanted a fairly good number of people, specifically five, but that we did understand it would likely be phased in over a number of years. What we did get is two people, one from the outreach and engagement committee and one from the ALAC. We now are in a position where we have to select the people. The outreach and engagement committee has proposed a number of rules or criteria for selecting their person, and we now need to decide on what we are doing for the ALAC.

The criteria that were identified for the outreach and engagement are commitment to management of the booth at the IGF, schedule implement outreach and engagement activities, and take the lead on information on At-Large activities. What we have discussed, and this is just draft, this is nothing decided, but we do have to make a decision

EN

before we do a call for volunteers, is the kind of things we're looking for on the ALAC side are not so much the outreach but actual active participation in IGF activities.

The criteria we're looking at are: possess IGF experience through previous attendance at national, regional or global IFG meetings, possess significant knowledge of At-Large policy issues and how they could impact end users, unlikely to attend if not funded through this program, required to actively participate in as many workshops as possible; and that doesn't mean count all the workshops, but we expect people to actually go to the workshops and to the extent they are on the speaker list, fine, if they're not on the speaker list, then be active participants to the extent that's possible within each context.

They're encouraged to network and provide feedback to the ALAC and encouraged to prepare a report following their participation. We're not focusing on just, "Write a report and then maybe we'll pick you the second time." We want people to actually be in the process and be benefiting both from the IGF and ensure that the IGF has the active participation of At-Large not only through specifically funded workshops but in the general context.

And I think the fact that we have gotten this kind of commitment, I think is a major sign that we are viewed as a major participant in IGF's and I think this is a really, really positive sign. We don't have a lot of time to discuss this right now, but I would like some feedback on to what extent do people on this call believe that the six criteria at the top are ones that we should use for deciding on who is the successful applicant? And

I'll open the speaker queue. Alberto, please go ahead. And I ask staff to please take notes of this so we can update the --

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. Perhaps it should be said that some person may go with the speaker, but at the same time this speaker and this list are prepared very well in advance, so perhaps we do not much the timeline for the preparation of this workshop. I think perhaps there will be no speaker from ALAC.

I participated in the Panama, the Brazil one, and you have to be prepared beforehand because to speak about we should go there with some printed material and we should ask Rodrigo de la Parra and the staff that always share sometimes with us, that we should share their table and their material because this is relevant that we should be ready well in advance.

If we do not do this, there will be an open mic and perhaps we may think about At-Large there always in relation to the specific topic discussed in that workshop. I did it twice, but we should take that into consideration as well. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. I'm presuming that the outreach and engagement subcommittee and whoever they select will be very active and will be working with the people, with ICANN staff in terms of manning booths, providing information and things like that. From the ALAC I think we're looking for someone who is participating, and I hesitate to use this

term, but sort of more on a managerial level and from a higher perspective than just trying to solicit more members.

We want to make sure that we are considered an active and visible part of the IGF process and that doesn't necessarily mean being on the speaker list; you're correct that the speaker lists are often determined quite early, but there's lots of opportunity at meetings to participate in discussions even if you're not one of the formal speakers. Anyone else with any thoughts? Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I cannot agree with you more about the duty of the person who'll be selected, but responding to Alberto, we are not asking people to be on the speaker list, it is too late now, all speaker lists are closed since long time. We ask them to participate from the floor because there will be people on the panel and then there will be discussions in the room. We need people to be visible. We need people to make a substantial contribution so that people see how the community of ICANN are really participating in the substance.

It's not only the board and the staff who are deciding in ICANN [inaudible] working on substance; the community is also and this will give our person we go, it will give him more visibility so that people will come to him and will speak to him rather than being in the corridor and saying, "We are the best, AFRALO is the best, etc. etc." Thank you.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Tijani. Anyone else want to speak? Alright, I've heard nothing saying that any of the six criteria should not be there, nor have I heard anyone suggesting anymore. Do people feel comfortable with us issuing a call for volunteers, and this is from the ALAC remember, based on this list and doing it sooner rather than later? Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I just had a question on the criteria when it comes down to actually engaging in discussions of IGF, so engaging in session at IGF. I thought that it was the RALO proposals for workshops that were going to produce most of the engagement in workshops, not the ALAC seat for the IGF travel slot.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, the RALO's that are putting on workshops will be creating the speaker list. They may choose if someone from the ALAC is selected for this, they may choose after the fact to add them to the list if they find it is applicable to whatever their topic is, just as there will be ICANN sponsored sessions and conceivably someone could be added to that list, but as Tijani and Alberto pointed out, to a large extent the speaker lists are already relatively fixed

And so, we're not saying that these people are speakers, we're saying we expect them to visible and active and coherent contributors to the overall IGF process that's going on. I don't think those two are at odds. Certainly, they're not from my perspective of my relatively limited participation in these meetings.

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: That makes sense. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I will propose that we do a call for volunteers and I'm presuming the outreach and engagement committee will be doing something similar. Perhaps Dev can, or someone else from outreach and engagement can confirm in the near future, and with a deadline probably of applications no later than the end of the Abu Dhabi meeting and selections done in a week or so after that so we can start travel arrangements. Does that sound reasonable?

I don't think we need a formal vote of the ALAC to do this but I would like to have a consensus if there's anyone who disagrees with this. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I don't think we need to wait till after Abu Dhabi because travel needs time to arrange trips etc. It is better to have our candidate or our selectee already known. It is not difficult to do, it is one week if you want to make a call for volunteers, it's one week for people to volunteer and then for us, for ALAC, we only need a few days, two days, three days to select one of the candidates.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. You and I are not speaking very differently. I don't know about you, I get on a plane a week from tomorrow or maybe a

week from today actually. I'm leaving for the airport just about this time a week from now. What I'm saying is yes, we will call for applications. I don't know if there's a lot of merit in putting the deadline early in the week. You're suggesting that perhaps we can get together somehow and actually make the selection while we're in Abu Dhabi, is that what you're suggesting?

We don't know how many applicants there'd be; there may only be one and the selection is easy. I have no problem with that setting the deadline to let's say be the start of the week in Abu Dhabi, and we can somehow figure out based on how many applicants there are how we make the decision. I don't want to suggest using the [inaudible] selection committee since it's made up of a significant number of ALAC people; that might be somewhat awkward. I think we're going to have to adlib this a little bit.

If there's no objection, then we'll go ahead issue the call soon and have the deadline early in the Abu Dhabi week. Done. Next item on the agenda, thank you very much on that. We hadn't identified this as a decision, but I think it's important to go forward. The next item on the agenda is to look at the ICANN60 planning and I'll turn it over -- our timing is we have 34 more minutes. We did allocate 30 minutes for this and a five minute very brief discussion preliminary to a longer discussion to be held at ICANN60 on ATLAS 3, so I will turn it over to Gisella, I presume, to take us through the agenda at this point.

I will point out to the extent that there are detailed agendas for the ALAC and At-Large leader working sessions they are subject to change,

we are still juggling sessions and trying to fit everything, but they're getting pretty close to final. Gisella, please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much, Alan. I just put in the chat the At-Large WIKI page for Abu Dhabi; please note that all the sessions, the development sessions, the RALO development sessions, the ALAC development sessions, the regular agendas etc., everything is posted on this page as well as the venue map, and all the agendas that are posted on this page where you have the links to the daily agendas, please note that these will be the most accurate and up to date agendas as we are no longer allowed to make any changes to the main ICANN schedule which is published on the ICANN60 webpage.

With regards to going through the agendas, I'm going to hand it over to Heidi and I'll take it back again then for the logistics and social events. Over to you, Heidi, thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much, Gisella. Hello, everyone. We're just going to go through the ALAC meeting. We're going to start on Saturday, so we put the link into the Adobe Connect so you can follow along. I'm going to just go through every item noting who has been invited. If I do not say that it's TBC, then you can assume that they are confirmed.

Starting on Saturday, 9 o'clock, we're going to have Alan welcome current and incoming leaders and special guests, then we continue with

the aims and objectives of At-Large in ICANN60, including discussion of At-Large session with ICANN board.

There are several questions as well as preparation for the cross-community sessions, and that goes until 10:15, followed by a coffee break, then we convene for part two that will be a full discussion, 90 minutes of new gTLD's, including community applications, applicant support, string confusion and closed generics.

ALAN GREENSBERG: Heidi, it's Alan. If I could interrupt, that session is still contingent of us finding suitable speakers and we are working with the PDP leaders to try to do that. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you for noting that.   Then when we reconvene again in the afternoon at 13:30 we're going to hand it over to Olivier who's going to lead us through the ICANN evolution session, and that's again a full 90-minute session, that is similar to a regular ICANN evolution meeting on all the issues, and staff will be notifying that group, so people who are part of the group as well as everyone else can join that session.

In the afternoon part four, we then will have a series of people speaking with you, including Denise Michel and Erik [inaudible] on the SSRRT, followed by Jonathan Zuck on the CCTRT, and then closing that session with Bryan Shilling an ICANN staff who is a consumer safeguards director.

The final session, and that agenda is still being worked on in terms of the details, there's going to be an organizational discussion on ATLAS 3. That will include issues such as travel, who should be going, the deadline for travel, the block schedule that was already determined earlier etc., and perhaps some themes, and there's another item on this agenda, looking as some of the parameters for ATLAS 3.

Moving to Sunday, we start the day with the At-Large review, just a short session, and we'll be inviting Rinalia; she's the chair of the OEC, Organizational Effectiveness Committee. Then we're going to have Renalia stay and invite Leon, or hopefully Leon will be there, and have a discussion with outgoing and incoming board members selected my At-Large.

Then we're going to have a 45-minute session on the ALAC [inaudible] is going to be leading. I see no questions, okay. Then in the mid-morning we'll have an ALAC discussion with SSAC; Julie is going to be moderating that. Then we have GAC, Sally Costerton will be coming with someone of her regional vice president and will be focusing on APRALO region including Save, Jerome and Baher on their activities as well as some aspects of the volunteer stakeholder journey for volunteers.

Then in the afternoon on Sunday we'll have a 30-minute session on public comments, looking at in particular which public comments ALAC should respond to and how, and then what the roll of staff is in developing the policy advice statements; and that comes directly from the At-Large review.

That's directly followed by a discussion with Ergys Ramaj and Betsy Andrews from the Public Responsibility Department, and that is going to be on primarily the Community Onboarding Program or the COP, followed by a very brief session on a pre-discussion for the joint ALAC and GAC meeting. Then two more sessions for the day; part 9 will be looking at the At-Large working group review. Alan, did you want to say a little bit about that?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I've said more than I probably should have said about the At-Large review at this point.

HEIDI ULLRIGH: In brief, our Evan has been working with Alan and myself on cleaning up the working group, so we're not only going to look at all of that, but we will be looking at which working groups would make sense to reinvigorate, if that's the correct word, and which ones seem to have reached their mission. That will be a good discussion. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, I will say something. We tend to actually have actions coming out of this meeting, not just yet another talk on working groups, and I'll stop there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Then we have a 25-minute discussion with staff, Patrick Jones from GSE and Carlos Reyes from Policy on a project that is just

starting called the Community Resource Consultation, which focuses on all the issues such as capacity development, support, administrative support, including our staff, travel support and outreach and engagement. There has been I believe a survey that has been sent and they're going to be just presenting on that.

Then the last hour of our session will be with the ccNSO and the agenda is still being developed for that.

Then we're going to move to Wednesday. This time, because of this setup of the schedule, we have our wrap-up on Wednesday so we have a two part wrap-up. The first part will be on Wednesday at 15:15 to 16:45; we'll have 30 minutes of ALAC actions followed by a discussion with Göran Marby and David Olive. Alan, just a reminder that also under this agenda item there is a point on which questions, which topics to raise with Göran.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I will echo what Heidi tells me on a regular basis, if we don't come up with substantive topics for him to talk about, he won't come.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Alan, exactly. I'm glad that message is getting though. Then finally, there's a debrief. Alan, I know you select these sessions of debrief on ICANN60. The final session, the final wrap-up part two will be reports, first with the liaisons; again apologies, we're just very short of time, 20 minutes there and 20 minutes from the RALO leaders, followed by 20 minutes for a chairs announcements.

Then moving to Friday, we have the ALAC development session that runs from 11 o'clock, we can start gathering at 10:30 until 18:30. This is only for continuing and incoming ALAC members and liaisons. We're going to put the agenda the link [CROSSTALK] --

ALAN GREENBERG: But it is mandatory for all of those.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, and you will have seen just about an hour or so ago a note from At-Large staff about this, and please do read that if you have not already. There are some preparatory activities; this is the development session, I'm just going to put that in the agenda, and I see Tijani has his hand raised.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Heidi. Tijani speaking. I'd like to draw your attention on that fact that all the ALAC members will be in the development on Friday, and in the meantime the academy working group, we have a meeting during this day; not a meeting with [inaudible] intercultural course, and all the ALAC members who are subscribed for this course will not be able to attend. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, may I…?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: You may answer or I can answer. Go ahead, please. I want to hear your answer.

HEIDI ULLRICH: My answer is that we informed all registered people for the academy that their sessions would overlap; we have I believe three in the RALO's and we have I believe one that I recall for the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: The short answer is we don't have a lot of choice. Either we have this session or we don't, and we did not know at the beginning when we requested budget for this Friday session that this is when this meeting would be held, and we have a conflict.

If anyone feels that they absolutely must go to that meeting, then I think we need to discuss it and see if we can figure out a way that people can divide their time. It's unfortunate, but I don't have a satisfactory answer other than ICANN meetings have conflicts, and there was really no way to either know ahead of time that this would be happening or a solution once we found out. Heidi, back to you, I have nothing else to say.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Does Tijani have his hand raised again?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I'm not in front of my computer, so please, go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Please Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am the only ALAC member who is subscribed for the course. I will not attend the course because I think that it's not efficient to share the time of the number of ALAC between the course and the development session; both are important, but if I have to choose I will choose the development session. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl for the record. I certainly don't think anyone trying to divide their time would find that at all profitable. If you're torn between both of the activities, you need to make a choice.   The structure of the development days for the ALAC is one that would benefit from coherent from start to finish.

                           Unfortunately, if you did want to attend the cultural awareness pilot call, which by the way I would have done if I wasn't running the development day, then you need to make a choice on what your priority is, it's pretty much as simple as that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I feel less guilty about this because -- I'll make probably a politically incorrect comment that although we all can use training like this on occasion, and I think we always learn something, we're probably not the group that this is targeted at primarily, for whatever that's worth. Please, back to Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm finished with sessions. Gisella, do you want to go first with the social activities and then, Cheryl, you can discuss more of the development session if you'd like.

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, this is Gisella for the record. As we have the development session up on the Adobe screen, for those who are connected to the Adobe Connect I'll hand it over to Cheryl and finish off on a lighter note with the social events.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Gisella. Cheryl for the record. I like to think that those of you who've already received the email and had time to look at it will have noted that this a slightly different format, with different materials and indeed differently designed objectives to previous ones. If you have done one of these before, fear not, you're not doing the same things again.

The other thing that is worthwhile noting as you go through your material on the agenda, is that there is preparatory material that each and every one of you, should you be there and going to attend, is

expected to come prepared with. There are some talking points which Gisella is showing on screen right now which you need to have some short form properly points and responses like an elevator pitch ready for each of those topics.

There's also some preparatory material for some of the icebreaking and interactive exercises, and you'll note when you read through this document that I request that you do not share the details of your preparation before we actually all get together on the day. With that, I guess we'll reveal the rest as it happens.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for that. Let's hand it over to Gisella to take us through the social activities and then we do have still a few other issues on this item. Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, thank you. Yes, if you just bear with me, sorry my Adobe Connect will not allow me to upload -- oh, it is. My slide is on its way but I shall continue to speak while it does. For the social events in Abu Dhabi we have the Saturday the APRALO/ALS dinner, which is by invitation only, but this is just for your information in case you are scheduling anything. On Sunday we have the DNS woman's cocktail which we're delighted to have back again and the fellows social networking event.

Monday the gala evening, which will be at the Emirates Palace. I will send a note out every day with the listed meetings, social events, etc., and will definitely note the dress code for the Emirates Palace if you are intending on going into the Palace where the gala evening will be held; there is a fairly strict dress code for both men and women.

On Tuesday we have Steve Crocker's farewell, that will be a wonderful evening for all his years with ICANN. The Gems will be playing afterwards, the time and the venue is yet to be confirmed. On Wednesday we have the APRALO showcase from 18:30 to 20:00, please do come to that and don't forget that the color for the region is red, so a touch of red would not go amiss.

On Thursday, last but not least, we have the community wrap-up from 20:00 to 21:00; note the late timing on that one is due to the board meeting being held until 20:00 on that day so we'll move swiftly from the board meeting straight through to the community wrap-up cocktail. That is as far as the social events that have been confirmed so far. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Gisella, you list on Saturday the APRALO/ALS dinner; at one point, this was going to be also including the all ALAC regional leaders and other travelers for the ALAC. Does that include them or not?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, this is Gisella for the record. We are looking into budget for that, but as it stands now, I prefer to put it as an APRALO/ALS dinner as it has not yet been confirmed that we can that open up up to the ALAC and regional leaders. This will probably be decided within the next week and we will communicate to all those who are invited to this dinner. As I said, I just prefer for now to keep it to the APRALO/ALS, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I suggest we always -- for many years now have had an ALAC and At-Large traveler's dinner either at the beginning of the week or on the Thursday towards the end of the week. If we cannot be accommodated on the APRALO one for budgetary reasons, can we do something in parallel so we at least have something where people can get together socially?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, it's Gisella for the record. Yes, as soon as I know what the status is on this dinner, I will be in touch with you to arrange and I'll send it to plan should we not be included.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If we don't think there's much food on Thursday then Thursday's another alternative. If the Thursday's going to be a lavish full meal at the wrap-up cocktail, then clearly Thursday is not a good choice, but it would be nice to do something so we can get together in a more social environment than our eight plus hours a day in our meeting room. Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just pointing, Gisella, to some of the comment in the chat, there's a bit of conversation. What is the dress code before people pack? Could you send out an email to the whole of ALAC just with the rules in the next day or so, so everybody can be prepared? Thank you. And also for women, for women particularly. Thank you, it'd be great.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Holly, yes, this is the dress code that I've just put in to the chat is for a restaurant but I think it's probably pretty much the same. Particularly for men…

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, I know. What Gisella said was particularly for the gala evening there is a strict dress code, and I was picking up that; and if that can apply for -- I've only seen stuff about men, I have not seen stuff about women, and I suspect that's more sensitive. Any advice would be really welcome soon. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Holly. Yes, it would be nice to know what you have to wear before you actually pack. Thank you for thinking of that.

GISELLA GRUBER: I was just on the website, it's Gisella again for the record. I just saw this for the Emirates Palace as I was checking on the venue and just

happened to notice the dress code cause anyone who will be going to one of the restaurants at the Emirates Palace which is part of the Kempinski group, you'll be subject to that if they wish to enter the Palace.

I have asked the meeting team to however to please confirm whether they there is a strict dress code for the gala evening itself or whether we will be able to get in as we come from the conference. I will keep you all posted hopefully within the next 24 hours. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If there is a link for the Emirates Palace dress code, then including that would be useful, thank you. Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, so let's come back if we could to the questions for discussion with Göran Marby. Again, we just need about two and even one might be enough. We just need to have our briefing note so we can reserve this spot.

ALAN GREENBERG: While people are thinking about that, I will note that there are very, very strict rules regarding what medications, including both prescription and non-prescription medications you can bring in, and if you are to believe the rules, some medications that no matter how many prescriptions you have, you cannot bring in. There may be ways around that, I don't know.

If anyone is travelling with prescription drugs, you should read the instructions, they're on the website, they include things like bringing a copy of the prescription not just the vial that they're in and you may want to pay attention to that. If anyone is on very strong drugs of any sort, you may want to check whether they are on the restricted list or not and perhaps consult with someone as to how to get around it if you are indeed dependent on such drugs.

Heidi, back to you. Has anyone come up with any thoughts on what do we want to talk to Göran about? Anyone want to talk to him? Anyone want to listen to him? We could better use our time with other things perhaps. By the way, I misspoke, it's not that he won't come; his staff won't invite him unless we give a list of topics. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. [Inaudible], Marby implemented a new complaint officer. Ask him about the result of this experience.

ALAN GREENBERG: Results if any so far with the complaints officer, or the impact of the complaints officer, if I understood you properly. Noted. Anyone else have anything? Note Cheryl has put some comments in the chat regarding clearance to bring certain drugs in.

Dev has said, "The challenges of ICANN as it relates to the public interest and multistakeholderism given the multi-lateral happenings around the world." I'm not sure Göran is the one to ask about public

interest; that is a board, not a staff issue. Holly says, "Can you give us 24 hours?" Yes, we'll give you 24 hours, but no more.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I have another…

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Can we ask him if he's feeling the difference as a staff leader? If there is a difference for the staff after the transition? Something changed after the transition for them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Second question. Anything else? We will look at whatever we get in in the next 24 hours and find a nice combination. What internet governance is in ICANN's remit? Again, I would think that's a board issue, is it not? Especially since the board has recently decided that IGF's are within their remit.

I would think that is a question that we could have raised during the board, and we may still, if we end up with spare time. Anyone else?

We are six minutes before the hour. Any other issues to discuss on the ICANN60 agenda item?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, this is Heidi. We have two more. We have outreach plans by Dev, and we have APRALO general assembly plan with Maureen and Holly. Maybe just a brief update.

ALAN GREENBERG: They're going to have to speak really quickly. Evin noted that there's something in the chat that he put in, but it's already rolled off my screen so I can't see it. But if staff can look at that and provide it, we will look at the summary in the 24 hours. Olivier wants to know what the board had for breakfast. They have crepes and Champaign; we know the board, that's what the board has

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: And caviar.

ALAN GREENBERG: And caviar, right. And Oliver, we'll give you a dried-out croissant.

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: That would be an upgrade over what I usually get.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we'll make you drink coffee instead of hot chocolate. Please, back to Holly or Maureen, or whoever is speaking on this subject.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll go first and then Maureen can pick up afterwards. One of the things that will happen is the capacity building workshops; there will be four of them starting on the Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday. There are a couple of themes in them; one will be about internet governance. We've also got a speaker on the dark web in case anybody's interested.

The final day will be hot topics which will be the actually participants identifying issues of concern/interest to them, so that plans to be a very interesting session. I don't think I need to mention APAC hub here, but Maureen, if you want to go with the rest of the agenda, that would be great. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Maureen for the record. Just very very briefly. The general assembly is pretty well packed with lots of discussion points, of course. We've got the showcase, which is getting pretty busy. The dinner, we've actually had to seek additional funding for a sponsorship for that which is why we're sort of like having to reduce our numbers for the APRALO attendees to the APRALO attendees; if we've got any spaces we'll invite other people, I'm sorry.

We've got an eBox that we're producing on the [inaudible] of diversity as an introduction to what we've been doing over the last 10 years, which is what we're celebrating in Abu Dhabi; and Ariel's doing some

work for us producing a little short video which we will present at the showcase or at the GA. That's it, thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen, tell everybody in APRALO, please wear red.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, we will do that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, did you wish to hand it over to Dev about outreach? I see he has his hand raised. This is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I will; sorry, I wasn't paying attention to that. Thank you, Heidi. Dev.

DEV ANAND: Thank you, Alan and Heidi. This is Dev. Regarding outreach at ICANN60, we had a conference call earlier this month and we've talked about and got input from Ali and Naveed to talk about what we could do, and it was decided to have an outreach session at the ICANN event and try to attract academia and their students to attend.

In order to ensure that we will have a room that would have microphones and interpreters and so forth, the outreach and engagement session scheduled for Monday 30th of October, from 15:15

to 16:45 will be split into two parts; and one half will be for the subcommittee agenda work, and the second half will be geared for the academia students, and we can also invite fellows and next gen to also attend.

That second session will then be from 16:00 to 16:45, and so we have a small agenda for that using some of our participations from the community onboarding and support, like how end users can impact ICANN introducing the At-Large community, some of the key policies issues of the At-Large community and a Q&A.

Currently, Naveed and Ali are tracking whether academia students can also attend the entire day instead of just trying to count it as one session. Given it's a Monday, which is the welcome ceremony, the public forum, and I guess the gala in the evening, if they can attend the entire day that would then require a group of us to meet the academia, the students, the professional lectures, to be there at 8 o'clock for them to register at the ICANN registration desk and then help guide attendees to which sessions they should go to.

And throughout the day have those attendees and the [inaudible] meet back early at the ICANN At-Large booth to answer questions and discus things, and then go off to other sessions. Naveed and Ali are going to be responding back early this week as to whether this is feasible, but that's the general idea given the time constraints we have.

There's one more thing, one more quick other thing. Olivier is following up with the NCUC regarding having a joint NCUC/At-Large session which will most likely happen on Saturday; and if that discussion comes

EN

through, then there's also another opportunity then to invite academia and At-Large. Hopefully, we'll get updates on that very soon this week as well. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier has his hand up.

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan.   I'll add very quickly to what Dev was mentioning regarding the NCUC session; they've got three hours on Saturday afternoon and the idea is a bit like the same thing that what happened in Copenhagen, discussing some policy topics. In order to be able to discuss some policy topics in very sort of basic terms and making them understandable for people, we need to have a few experts, a few people from the ALAC, from At-Large to be in the room as well, otherwise we'll only have some NCUC people that will be in the room, and I think it's important that we have a few more people than we did in Copenhagen.

I know that ALAC has got some things going on simultaneously with it, but let's try and work out who we could delegate to come in the room. I'll certainly be going there because I'll be co-moderating and I hope that we'll just try and see who we can send; three, four people would be enough, more than that would be great. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are two minutes past the hour. How close are we to the end? We have Tijani's hand is up now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. It's only to ask Olivier which time slot it will be?

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: Saturday afternoon, three hours.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Saturday afternoon?

ALAN GREENBERG: All Saturday afternoon, apparently.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, but Saturday afternoon we are in the CWG meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that's Friday afternoon. Saturday afternoon you're in ALAC meetings.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, yes. Important At-Large sessions all the way through. Olivier, it's a shame that we haven't heard about this until now because we could have perhaps adjusted the schedule, but it's much too late for that now.

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLOND: It was an action item that I was given at the outreach and engagement working group, I'm really sorry you weren't old about it, but it was there. Yeah, you should know about it.

ALAN GREENBERG: As pointed out before, it's an ICANN meeting, there will be conflicts. We try to arrange the schedule factoring that in, but we're not going to be 100% successful. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, it took me a moment to get off mute. It's actually a piece of return business if I may, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go for it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just an update, you may not have caught your emails while you were running the meetings which is why I thought I'd bring your attention as well as that of the ALAC to the fact that you, Holly, and I have received a message from Rinalia in her capacity as chair of the OEC regarding the At-Large review outlining why the order of things should be the way they are in her opinion and that of the incoming chair of the OEC, Khaled.

We have had an update but the long and the short of it is perhaps out of this sentence, which I thought would be worthwhile sharing as you close

the meeting, she says the following, "We understand that you are concerned about possible misinterpretation of information by MSSI in the MSSI exercise. OEC would open to corrections that the At-Large may make in its review of the mapping document and its contents. When something is unclear, you may expect that the OEC will request clarification and that you would have an opportunity to explain the At-Large's position and content as you did when the OEC met in Montevideo in September."

The order is not in the way you would perhaps prefer it, Alan, but I think the outcomes are going to be okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. To be clear, I had no doubt that eventually we will get a chance to comment on it. I have absolutely no doubt that it would play out that way. That is not the same as being able to comment on it before they deliberate on it and perhaps make some choices. I do deem them to be different and I may choose to disagree with our board member, but I'll read the document for myself. Anything else? Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Olivier, count me in.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are we done with ICANN60 prep discussion?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Is there any other business? Nobody had any at the start of the meeting, one last chance.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, do we have any other business?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, we've skipped an item. Agenda item 11, initial discussion on ATLAS III parameters.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, we will talk about: initial discussion on ATLAS III parameters. We are going to have the third ATLAS At-Large summit in 2018, about a year and half from now roughly. In the At-Large review our response we are committing to a significantly increased focus on individual members and an increased attempt to get At-Large structure members, not just the representative, to be active in ICANN policy processes.

In the past, ATLAS's first choice essentially has been representatives of ALSes, although in some cases a representative was not able to come and might be replaced by someone else. We are going to have to think

about to what extent do we modify this if any, and to what extent do we take other actions, if we are living in a world a year and half from now where we are actually successful and have significant contributions from various people, both individual members and ALS members, and to what extent do we want them to participate in meetings such as ATLAS.

That doesn't say that for instance, if we have a brand-new ALS that we want the representative to come or someone to come so they see ICANN, but if we are in a world where we have active workers that are different from ALS representatives, do we want to factor that in; and I think we need to start having that discussion moderately soon. The deadline for selecting attendees will be December 2018 -- sorry, the meeting will be in 2019, the deadline for selecting participants will be December 2018.

That's a little over a year from now and it's a discussion we have to start and we will be starting it in Abu Dhabi without any presumption on how it ends, but I think we need to make sure that what we're doing for the ATLAS is constant with what we are promising to do in response to the At-Large review. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry, old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Other than that, the discussion will be held, there will be a discussion in Abu Dhabi, but this is just the prelude to start thinking

about it. We are likely going to have to change our policies to some extent. It may only affect people -- we still may try to allocate one per ALS, but if someone can't come, then we may allocate it outside of their ALS or something like that.

It's going to require some innovative out of the box thinking, I think, to use the money that we get for ATLAS travel effectively so we can use it to help increase policy contributions, which I'm not sure has been the case in the past. It's a good discussion we'll have in a few weeks. Any further comments?

In that case we will go on to any other business, any other business? No hands, no voices. Thank you all for your attendance -- oops, we have a hand. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Only to say that Wafa still doesn't have her visa. I don't have anything arranged for her travel. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, who does not have a visa?

GISELLA GRUBER: Wafa.

ALAN GREENBERG: Wafa does not have a visa. Yes, Gisella, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Alan, I didn't raise my hand; the computer is taking longer than my voice takes. This is Gisella for the record. Just to say that I'm aware of what's happening with Wafa, I followed up with her today. I've been in touch with constituency travel, I'm just trying to find out where the missing link is, but more importantly, resolving the issue; so I am working on it, Tijani, and I'm in touch daily with Joseph about this. Hopefully, it will all get sorted. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Gisella. There reality is that we may end up with visa problems that we can't solve, but it's really important that we know about them. If there's anyone else with problems that Gisella is not working on day by day, please let her know.

And with that, not hearing any other business, I will again thank you for participation in this meeting. It was a long meeting, I think a productive one, and we'll see you online. Bye-bye.

GISELLA BRUBER: The meeting is now being adjourned. The audio will now be disconnected. Thank you very much for joining today's meeting and we look forward to seeing everyone in Abu Dhabi in just over a week. For now, wishing you a good evening, a good morning or a good afternoon wherever you may be. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]