| GISELLA GRUBER: | Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Tuesday, the 28th of November at 21:00 UTC. On today's call we have Hadia Elminiawi, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Kaili Kan, Maureen Hilyard, Andrei Kolesnikov, Bastiaan Goslings, Sebastien Bachollet. Sorry, Ashley, if you could please mute the 90 line, thank you very much. Alberto Soto, Bartlett Morgan, Ricardo Holmquist, Alan Greenberg, Javier Rua-Jovet, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjo Lansipuro. |

We also have Olivier Crepin Leblond, Bram Fudzulani, Barrack Otieno, Abdulkarim Ayopo Oloyede, Vernatius Eseama, Isaac Maposa, Chokri Romdhane, Kris Seeburn, Wale Bakare, Erich Schweighofer, Vanda Scartezini, Raymond Mamattah, Marita Moll, Leah Symekher, Glenn McKnight, Judith Hellerstein, Wafa Dahmani, Sarah Kiden.

On the Spanish Channel we have Wladimir Davalos. On the French Channel we have Gabriel Bombambo, Guiguemde Rodrigue, Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, and Adam Doungous. We currently don't have anyone on the Russian Channel. Apologies noted from Satish Babu, Christopher Wilkinson, John Laprise, Ali AlMeshal, and Seun Ojedeji. And we also have, my apologies, Eduardo Diaz on the call.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silivia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yesim Nazlar, Evin Erdogdu, Claudia Ruiz, Mario Aleman, and myself, Gisella Gruber. We have Spanish interpretation with Veronica and David, French interpretation with Claire and Camila, and Russian interpretation with Ekaterina and Yulia.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

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 channel and to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. I also forgot, Siranush Vardanyan from the staff roll call. I hope I haven't left anyone else off, and if not, I'm not hearing anything, I'll hand it over to Alan Greenberg. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Gisella. I don't know what we're doing right to have such attendance today, but if it keeps up, we're going to have to go on to the practice of saying we'll do attendance based on Adobe Connect without reading out names. This is quite fantastic. Maybe there was a lottery or prizes being given out that no one told me about. I hope it's just because everyone knows these meetings are marvelous, or not. We'll find out I guess.

Anyway, welcome to everyone. This is quite a turnout and I'm very impressed, and this, I believe, unless I'm missing something, is the first ALAC meeting of the new ICANN year. So welcome, and I hope we'll have a good year going forward. It should be an interesting meeting and I'll go first of all to ask is there anyone who has any comments on the agenda or any new items for any other business? [AUDIO BREAK]

Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we have Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I hope that you can hear me okay. I think we need, maybe not on the call today, we need to take into account the question

of data privacy also in our own organization and not just on how we translate gTLD or ccTLD, but how we were under all this question for At-Large, ALSes, the RALOs, and the ALAC. It seems to me that it's a question that we need to sort internally and not to wait for ICANN to start to solve that [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Actually, there was an item I was going to put on the agenda today that relates to that, and that's related to email addresses for ALAC members, regional leaders, and for contacting, ALSes. I don't, however, have an answer from staff that I had requested, so we will defer it, and probably, I'll handle it in email going forward. But thank you for that reminder. Anyone else have any other comments?

Then, we'll treat the agenda as accepted and go on to the next item, and the first substative item is review of action items. Heidi has put zero minutes, so I'm assuming there is nothing which requires the attention of the ALAC going forward on action items out of Abu Dhabi or other meetings. Is that correct, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Thank you, Alan. Yes. Since there are so many regional leaders on the call, it might be worthwhile for them to take a look at that during their own time since there are many action items for the RALOs. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have a substantial amount of time allocated for policy issues today for a number of reasons. Partly, there is a, what I believe is a rather critical item that is closing in the next couple of days and we have to address, and second of all, there's a fairly large number of relatively critical items going forward, a fair number of them on the accountability issues, that we have to make sure are adequately covered. But we'll start with the one on the Reserve Fund.

Sebastien did a really good job of going through the document and identifying the critical issues that they had raised and proposing a number of answers. I met with Sebastien earlier this week and we talked about it and I volunteered to take his notes and try to draft them into a single statement that we could look at, and I in fact did that and sent that out earlier today, and posted it to the Wiki, and if we could have it in the Adobe Connect room as well. It's a relatively short statement. [AUDIO BREAK]

Alright, I won't read it verbatim, but essentially, it says that number one, we strongly support that there be a reserve and we agree that the 12 month minimum is reasonable, and higher if practical without going into a lot of details. The current target within ICANN is indeed 12 months and the proposal is at least 12 months and perhaps as high as 17 months and therefore they are not proposing any real change because the current one is at least 12. It doesn't specify a target maximum. We are currently so far away from that maximum that I don't think it's a real issue at this point.

We do note, however, that since the reserve fund is coupled to the operating budget, the document talking about the reserve should have

given more input on what the operational budget is and how it is tracked over the last couple of years and how it's projected to track. We can find that information out historically, but I think it's quite reasonable that the document should have gone into more detail of that. Linked to that, since the largest expense is in fact employees or contractors, because ICANN uses them a little bit interchangeably, then there should have been some information on that.

Now, that's normally presented within the operational plan and budget, but since the reserve is linked to it, it's quite correct I think that we point out that they should have made some reference to it in this document.

And then, we talk a little bit about how we get it up. Right now, we are significantly under a year. I think we're at somewhat about eight months, and we did do a $5 million return to reserve this year, but if we're to complete the reserve at even a year's rate, it's going to take us five, six years to get there, and that seems not prudent, that is, we're operating for two long a period at a reserve well under a year. And that seems to be a dangerous thing. So we're suggesting that ICANN look at other possible sources of revenue that it can use to top up the reserve.

There's a real danger that if we are too aggressive using operational funds to top up the reserve, the easiest place to cut funds is out of the AC/SO operational budget, or the special budgets, rather, and a number of other things related to that. And it's not clear that we want to see great pressure put on those parts of the budget. So, other sources seem to be appropriate.

And I will open the floor and I'll point out, we really only have about 10 minutes to discuss that, so I ask people to be as concise and short as possible. We do need to come to closure pretty quickly if we're going to approve the statement, or at least be able to send the statement out, even if we approve it after the fact. Yes, okay. First of all, please Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I'm Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, and [inaudible] when I [inaudible] GNSO liaison report, but I just want to share with you now because it seemed appropriate. Obviously, I'm now [inaudible] up the council. There's also the matter for the council's input on this as well, and there is a disagreement between the drafting chain for the council's opinion and thus the registry and registrar stakeholder group. So, it will be to quote [inaudible] on the meeting. That should be interesting.

That one I wanted to share with you was that that registry-registrar stakeholder group did not [inaudible] reserve fund should not be more than 12 months, adamant on that. The registry stakeholder group maintains that any attemps to [inaudible] auctions from all the plenish reserves by an increased fee to registry or registrar should not be considered. Just sharing that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll point out that if registries and registries agree on anything, they have an effective veto on council. Individually, they do not. So, this looks like it should be in discussion.

Marita, please go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Yes, Cheryl was breaking up pretty badly and it was hard to really get what she was saying, but my question is, or my point is, do we have any information about what a normal reserve fund level is for a company of this size?

Because I'm not an expert in this but certainly there must be information out there about what is the standard in financial planning. If 12 months is a standard, I would be okay with that. But if 24 months, I've heard a lot about 24 months also in the meetings in Abu Dhabi, what is the standard? Does anybody know, or has there been any background research done on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. The document that was published and the staff might put a link into it, goes into a fair amount of detail as to what the level reserve is for non-profits and for internet-related non-profits, and typically, based on my experience, the minimum is a year. There are some that are less. The examples they gave in the report are CIRA, the Canadian Internet Registry, has a 12 month reserve; Nominet, the UK one is 24 months, and there's one or two other organizations referenced in there.

So, a year is basically the minimum that anyone considers as a reasonable reserve for a non-profit that has somewhat potentially risky

income and potentially unknown expenses due to litigation or other things like that.

MARITA MOLL: So, would it be reasonable to say something like that, that there is a minimum that we'd like to see it a little more than that, with the perspective or the idea that once we reach that, we should continue going beyond that, like to 16 months? Does that make sense?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what they're saying in their proposal and what we are saying, effectively. Certainly, we're far enough away right now from the 12 months that we could reconsider the exact level when we get to 12 months, but at this point, they are saying no less than 12 and the target is high as 17, but that depends on whether we have a viable way of getting there or not. So, we certainly could put a stronger statement in, but that's pretty much exactly what we are saying right now.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I guess my document was not read at all because it was not my suggestion. I feel that I might be also not very good at

explaining what I meant here, but if you take my [inaudible], it was written two things, [inaudible] specifically. It was written that my first conclusion was to have a target level of $135 million to $145 million. And yes, it is currently the level of one year budget or expense of the organization.

But the second conclusion was not to do it, to link the reserve fund with any type of figures by the organization because we don't know where this organization is going, taking into account the number of staff and the expense level. I think it was one of my requests [inaudible] to have comparison, we need to have some scenarios. That's why I would like to define the targets with a number, not with a number of years, but with a number, with a figure of dollars, and I suggest that 135 to 140 million dollars. And that's it. No more, I would say no less. Sometimes it could be less.

And the other point linked with that is to ask for a target date to replenishment of this reserve fund. And there was a question on the chat, what does the end user feel about that? The end user doesn't care. But we care as we need this organization as the only one who support [inaudible] multistakeholder and allow the voice of the end user to be heard. And it's why we need ICANN.

For ICANN to still be alive, it seems that if ICANN has too much trouble, one day it will close, whatever is the level of the reserve fund. What the reserve fund will be used for, it's mainly if ICANN is going into deep trouble, it's about to close the shop, and if we close the shop, we need to pay the contractors and the employees in that state. And one year of [inaudible] funds is enough for what they need to do if ICANN has to

close. It's why -- and to not push them to hire more people to increase expense. It's why I suggest to fix a number and to ask a deadline to recover the funds. Thank you.

And my last point before -- it's that I don't think it's a good idea in this document to talk about how we will put the money in this fund. It will be the next discussions, and if we stop already the next discussions, we will get into trouble. That's my two cents. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you Sebastien. Let me try to summarize what you've said and make sure I have it clearly. Number one: you are suggesting that we not set the reserve. That we recommend the reserve not be set as a number of months, but as an absolute figure regardless of whether the operational budget goes up or down? Am I interpreting that correctly?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Yes, correct. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Number two, you are suggesting that we not talk about how to replenish the fund, which means essentially we're saying, "This is a target but there's no practical way to get there." At $5 million a year, if we can make $5 million a year, we are not likely to get there very quickly, if at all.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But it would be the next discussion, it would be the next document. They are doing step by step. Let's take the steps suggesting this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, let me take a quick poll because we do have to come to closure on this. Sebastien is suggesting that we have a fixed number that is not tied to the operational budget. I personally think that is incorrect because I don't believe that the reserve is just to close down the organization. I believe the reserve is to handle unexpected costs that may materialize that are not in the operational budget and have a place to get that money quickly if necessary. And that is not the same as just closing down the organization.

I'd like a quick poll and this is of ALAC members, please. How many people would like to see a change to an absolute number instead of a number of months as currently expressed? Put X's or [inaudible] or checked in and if you're not on Adobe Connect, please get that message to us vocally or in the chat. [AUDIO BREAK]

We have four X's and one message in the chat saying he agrees, and we have only one check mark, so Sebastien, I'm afraid that does not seem to be a popular view at this point. And next point is, do we mention, in what the current statement says that a plan is required and we are suggesting places where the plan might propose to get some additional funds, so if you could take down your X's or check marks right now. I'm sorry, we have a speaker right now. Sebastien, is that a new hand?

EN

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, just to say that I don't care to be popular or unpopular. Just I want to let you know that I spent four years in the board's finance committee and I am the chair of the board's finance committee for [inaudible]; therefore, I have a little knowledge of what is happening and not for profit organizations.

And one of the reasons I am suggesting to put a fixed number is to force the staff and the CEO not to go too much higher with the number of people hired with the level of expense. With this level element, whatever is the project, we will have not funding one year, we will have enough to do it. But, once again, I am in the minority. It happens very often, but sometime you will remember that, and we will discuss again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sure we will, Sebastien. Alberto. Alberto put down his hand. Do you still want to speak? [AUDIO BREAK]

I guess not. Alright, the next question on the table.

ALBERTO SOTO: I just wanted to say that I had written on the chatroom; I had written my opinion there and it was not really listed there. I was counting one on my opinion is already there. My opinion was there. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Noted Alberto. The next question is, do we want to make reference to where ICANN might find additional funds going forward, or do we want to be silent on that? Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm sort of halfway in between. Seriously, I have difficulty with the auction proceeds because for the longest time we've been saying, "They should be quarantined and should be used for particular purposes as a one off." So, to use them as reserve funds isn't a one off. I'm happy to talk about a couple of other suggestions, but --

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, sorry to interrupt. Why do you say that's not a one off? What we're suggesting is that a certain amount be taken out. It is a one off. But the reserve only has to be topped off once at this point.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, my idea of a reserve fund, if we're building up a reserve fund and we've already said auction fund should be something special, well reserve funds generally aren't special, and what we're doing is diminishing what else we might do with it. Given that we've had such discussions over the years about what we can do with the auction proceeds to literally just use it as a way to plug a hole, I'm less comfortable with than I am with the other suggestions.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will note as I noted it in an email that the other suggestion is to use gTLD funds that are either currently held or future fees is going to be a much much harder sell. So, I wouldn't count on those. Anyone else like to speak?

So, at this point, what I think Holly has said is she wouldn't mind seeing suggestions on how to build the reserve fund, but she wouldn't want to see auction funds listed. I think if we don't mention auction funds, then I think we'll miss the whole thing. Again, a quick poll of the ALAC. Do we include the reference to where funds might be available, or do we not include it? Easy enough to take that section out. [AUDIO BREAK]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Alan, I'm sorry, Sebastien Bachollet speaking. What is the question and how do you want us to vote?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, the question is do we leave the section in largely as it is right now, or remove any reference to where ICANN might be able to find additional funds? If you want to keep it in, use a check mark. If you want to remove it, use an X. We have two X's right now. I see no checkmarks and several X's. We will remove that section. Thank you. Anyone have any further, last comments? [AUDIO BREAK]

The statement will be revised and put in as a statement to be voted. If anyone has any further comments on it, please post them to the Wiki. This will be done shortly after this meeting is complete, and if you have any comments please look at it and post them today if at all possible,

whatever your today is. The statement has to be issued within two days, and we will start an ALAC acceptance decision after the fact.

Next item, now I'll turn it back over to Ariel. Well, not back over because we never went to her, to start talking about the other policy statements and where we are in each of them. [AUDIO BREAK]

Do we have Ariel on the call?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Ariel, this is Heidi, if you're speaking you're on mute.

ARIEL LIANG: Not on mute.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can hear you.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you. That's strange. So the next one is on Enhancing Accountability - Recommendations for Diversity. Deadline is December the 15th and we have Sebastien, Yrjo and Bastiaan co-drafting a statement. Is there any updates on that [inaudible] that want to share?

ALAN GREENBERG: While we're waiting, I'll make a comment that in several of these cases, the statements are being drafted by people who were active participants in the discussion within the CCWG Work Stream 2. It is

really important that we have other people if not as a drafter then as a contributor to contribute. I don't know who was talking or what he was saying, but Sebastien has his hand up. Please go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. Sebastian Bachollet speaking. Just to say about this topic. I can support the other two to write something, but I was very very involved and very biased on any position on that, and I would like very much that my two other do their first draft and I will act if any need. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will ask the people who were involved to decide amongst themselves. [Person speaking another language].

We seem to have Russian on the English Channel. I will ask the people who are working on it to work amongst themselves and decide --

RECORDED VOICE: [Inaudible] and your call has been terminated. Please load Airtime.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am tempted to terminate this call myself. Is anyone else hearing these comments or am I the only one getting this? Okay. I will say it once more. I will ask the people to work amongst themselves. If there is a problem, please wave red flags and ask for help. If we don't hear a

EN

request for help, we'll assume this is going to be proceeding on time. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I sent an email regarding this very issue, CCWG Work Stream 2 recommendation of some subgroups, four subgroups. It is very important for us, as a charting organization to comment on those recommendations. Myself, I cannot make the statement because I am now one of the co-chairs and second, I am also in one of those subgroups. And I prefer it's better that another one take the pen, hold the pen, and draft something.

We need four people, because we have four statements, four reports, and I think it is not difficult to do so, I am willing to help. At least for jurisdiction one and for the others if it is needed, but we need people to hold the pen and to write something. It is not normal that the charter organization doesn't comment on the recommendations of the subgroups. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Any further comments explicitly on the one on diversity? [AUDIO BREAK]

Seeing nothing. Ariel, what is the next one?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The following ones are also CCWG Work Stream 2 topics. The others is on Jurisdiction, Ombudsman, and Staff Accountability, so

Tijani mentioned that, and the only one that hasn't been assigned to -- or we haven't got confirmation that we have the penholders for Staff Accountability, but Maureen Hilyard would do the public comment and then Basitiaan also mentioning the comment that he's willing to draw something with Maureen about that topic, so I will put the link in the chat and you can take a look at the comments in the comment section on the Wiki.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Thank you. You'll note that several of the people who have been assigned these tasks are members of the ALT. That's because these policy issues were reviewed on the ALT meeting a few days ago, but we really cannot ask only ALT members to be the drafters on these things. We really need other members of the ALAC, other regional leaders, and other At-Large members to participate in this. We have a little bit on the jurisdiction one, but we really need other people to participate to make sure that what we're saying is in fact a widespread view and not the review of just one person.

So, I'm not going to point to people on this call. There's a lot of people on this call. If none of these issues are of interest to anyone, then I really have strong worries about At-Large. These are all very important issues for going forward. So, I do ask you to review what is there, review the documents, and if you have some thoughts on it, all you need to do is put a comment on the Wiki. You don't need to volunteer to draft the whole statement, but you do need to contribute your thoughts, so I strongly encourage people to do that.

Ariel, are there any other statements that are either pending or upcoming very quickly?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, and Tijani raised his hand, so I'll let Tijani speak first.

ALAN GREENBURG: Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. I'd like to remind you that we have at least two subgroup accommodations that the public comments close on December, one on 5 December and the other 15 December, I'm not sure. I don't have them, those documents. So, it is very urgent. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBURG: Thank you Tijani. That's why I focused on the Diversity one because that one does have a deadline of the 15th of December. The other one is the Office of the Ombudsman.   That goes on to the 22nd of December. The other ones close in very early January, so given that many people within At-Large celebrate holidays over the end of December, there's not a lot of difference between the middle to end of December and the very beginning of January in terms of availability.

Ariel, any other ones that are upcoming that we need to focus on now?

ARIEL LIANG: It's not upcoming, it's open, so there's a new public comment on Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team - New Sections to Draft Report of Recommendations. That will end on January 8th.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's my birthday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Happy Birthday, whoever said that. [AUDIO BREAK]

Do we have anyone who has any interest in Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice or new gTLDs? Holly, your hand is up.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's my birthday and I'm putting my hand up for that because I've already read the report one so, put my name down against it.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I ask other people to please comment on what Holly says or provide your input to her at the beginning.

ABDULKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Can you also put me down?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're going to have to tell us who you are.

ABDULKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Sorry. My name is Abdulkarim Ayopo Oloyede. Hello? My name is Abdulkarim Oloyede.

HOLLY RAICHE: Abduljalil. Is that Abduljalil?

ABDULKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Abdulkarim.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Abdulkarim. That's Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Yeah, that's correct.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, and we've also got Christian too. So we've got three people on that one, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, I'm happy then. Any other ones right now, Ariel, that are open and have deadlines?

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. There is another one on Operating Standards for ICANN's Specific Reviews. I reached out to the ALAC representatives [inaudible] RDS WHOIS, ATRT, and also the SSR review teams, just reaching out to them specifically asking for advice. We did hear back from Carlton and one other person about the importance to comment on this, but nobody has followed through to draft something yet. And Alan, you are CC'd in that email because you are one of the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed I am. That one closes on the 15th of January. Let's see if we can get any comments. Ariel, if anyone has any comments at all in the email, please ask them to post it to the Wiki, or post it to the Wiki for them if they don't do that themselves. It's really important.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: If necessary, I will corral people going forward. [AUDIO BREAK]

Anything else on policy issues that we need to discuss at this point? [AUDIO BREAK]

Then let's go on to the next item and report on ALS and Individual members.

EN

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. Oh sorry, it seems Judith has a question. Judith, would you like to take it or wait until the next?

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, Judith, is this on policy, or ALS and Members?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Policy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So, I'm looking at the link. Maybe I've just not commented. Where do we find the draft of the one on diversity that Sebastien and Yrjo have been writing? There's nothing. I'm all confused about where I'm supposed to be clicking on to read a draft of what was written.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if they have written a draft or not at this point. If there's nothing on the Wiki, then whatever they've done, they have not published at this point. If there is no draft published, then the only thing to read is the document that was put out by the CCWG. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastein Bachollet speaking. Nothing was written on that. The only place where I know that something was written is about the reserve fund, and we already discussed that, but they are not yet unfolding for Diversity, nothing is published yet and even written, I guess.

ALAN GREENBERG: But certainly, anyone can read the report on Diversity and put a comment into the Wiki saying, "I think that's great," or, "I think that's garbage," and if so, what part do they think is garbage and what part do they think is great and what would they like to see instead? So, it's there for anyone to work on. Judith, any follow on?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Back to ALS and Individual Member Report.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Alan. This is Evin speaking. So, we have updated the agenda, by the way. It's in the AC Room and also, the Wiki page is updated. Just to go through quickly, we will have one ALS up for decertification vote next week. It was a member of EURALO. It's the Committee for a Democratic United Nations or CADUN.

We will also next week have a vote to accredit a new EURALO ALS, which is Norway Chapter of the Internet Society, and we have quite a

few applications who will then be decided on their respective RALOs whether to proceed to ALAC vote. They're all listed there. And we have a few more as well that we're waiting on some applicant feedback for before submitting to the RALO for their feedback.

Going on to individuals, we have one, two, three, four, five; about five applications that will also soon be voted on as per the RALOs procedure for accepting individual members. And then we also have an upcoming orientation call and we will coordinate with LACRALO to schedule an orientation call sometime in January. And that's it from me unless you have any questions. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Judith has her hand up.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. There were several, as Glenn has also pointed out, there were several ones that Glenn and I had sent to the group for decertification, one especially that the organization who created it has decertified it. So, that is the Disability Chapter. ISOC has taken away that chapter. So, with it not being an ISOC Chapter, it needs to be decertified, because there's no one there.

And then several others have passed a year in warnings and Glenn and I have sent them up. Glenn posted them in the chat, and he says we submitted them months ago, which is correct. And Glenn is an officer, so he can put them for decertification, but they would be certified and

listed on the Wiki, and all the works been done over that. But the special needs one doesn't exist anymore.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Judith. If staff may check with the current NARALO leadership to make sure we have all the records that Judith, who's making references to, and we will do our best to make sure we keep our things in order.

Just a quick comment. If an organization exists but is no longer an ISOC chapter, they may need a name change, but that doesn't mean they don't exist anymore and cannot be an ALS. Now, if they cease to exist all together, that's a different issue. I'm just making it clear that we do not accept ISOC chapters purely because they're an ISOC chapter; it's because they are a viable organization in their own right.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, what has happened here was that ISOC disabled the special needs, ISOC has decertified it. There's a movement to create a special interest group of a totally different group of people, so a totally new organization and members. Those members are not working anymore.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, I was not talking about that particular group. I was just making it clear to everyone on the call that ISOC Chapter status alone is not a criteria for membership as an ALS. That's the only point I was making. Tijani, please go ahead.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. First I will comment on what you just said. If you have an ALS which is an ISOC Chapter and that they are not ISOC Chapter anymore, then it should be decertified and even if the same people are on the organization which has now a new name, so a new name, need to make a new application. They will be certified as a new ALS. I think this is the way to do it, otherwise there is no way to change the name of an ALS or to say, "Yes, they were ISOC. They are not ISOC today." Since the ISOC chapter disappeared, the ALS disappeared, and then the new organization or association can submit an application and be certified as an ALS. This is the first one.

Second, I would like to speak about the ALS and give their members applications for AFRALO. We have today 11 applications for ALS and we have six, not five items, we have six individual applications. It is huge. It is very very big as a new application. This may mean that people are more interested now, but when you look at the applications, you are confined a little bit confused because people are applying just to be there. Sometimes they don't, how to say, give the necessary proof that they are really working for the interest of the end user.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, may I interrupt. We have another item on the agenda, item number 10, which is talking just about that issue. So, if we could defer the discussion and go on from the reports right now of current status. It's an important issue, but it will be addressed later on in the agenda.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a long speaker queue. Sebastien. By the way, on the issue of whether an ISOC Chapter should be decertified if it's no longer an ISOC Chapter, that's an interesting discussion. I don't think it's on our critical path today to resolve, so I apologize for making the statement, and I would prefer if we not belabor that point right now. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Alan, Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Just to ask staff if they can add one column with the number of country and territories in each of the regions, not the one where we have an At-Large structure, but the total number. It will be very useful to have some comparison number.

And my second one I have, I don't know if it will be discussed later, but I think at the general picture, we need to be, I will say, careful. We need to find other ALSes than just by the chapter; if not, we will be common an ISOC chapter, and I was reflecting one of the ISOC chapters, and I know where I come from, but I think it's important for At-Large to think about that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Any further comments on the reporting of ALSes and Individual members? If not, then we'll go on to the next agenda item, which is number six. That is Reports from liaisons, RALOs or

anyone else that believes they need to bring things to the attention of the ALAC and this group. Reports are normally filed on the Wiki, and we don't need full reports, but if there's anything particularly urgent that people want to bring up, please do so. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPiN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry, Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I had trouble putting my hand up for some reason. It took three or four minutes. Just on the previous topic on the Norway Chapter of the Internet Society. We have conducted due diligence, as in looking at all of the input in the form, so it's not because it was an ISOC chapter that we looked at it in any different way than we would have done for any other organization.

So the response or the recommendation from EURALO stems from what was on the form, not specifically because it was ISOC or not ISOC. That said, I have personally spoken to the person in charge of this chapter. I've met him at EuroDIG and they were very eager to do things and to be involved, so that's just all I wanted to just add to the discussion. Sorry for being late on this, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Back on to item six on reports. Does anyone have anything they believe they want to bring to our attention right now? [AUDIO BREAK]

Maureen, please go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:	Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to mention about the joint meeting [inaudible] proposing already for the Puerto Rico meeting with the ccNSO and ALAC. Due to the very active discussion that took place in response to John Laprise and [inaudible] intervention about the domain registration protection issue that was raised in Puerto Rico, and I just wanted to say, it's really nice to have Javier [inaudible], thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. Anything further? We have Julie said there's nothing from her. I see no one else's hand up. I'm told there's a significant lag on Adobe Connect today in some places. So, I'll wait a few seconds. [AUDIO BREAK]
	Or if anyone wants to speak, just start speaking. [AUDIO BREAK]
	Hearing nothing, we will go on to the next agenda item. And that is the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee. There's a document to display on that. I also sent it out to the ALAC earlier today. Let me summarize. In the meeting in Abu Dhabi, we decided that we would repopulate the group with the appointed people, refresh the membership, to make sure that our membership list was active and proceed. When we started carrying that out, it turned out there was a bit of a problem.
	First of all, the leadership structure is somewhat confusing on this group. If you look at the wiki page, you'll see there is a chair. There are also five co-chairs. Now, normally, a group has a chair and vice-chairs perhaps, or has co-chairs. This one seems to have a chair and co-chairs, and they overlap, and one person is both a chair and a co-chair. So, that

EN

was somewhat confusing. It was also not clear how the co-chairs were appointed. Were they self-selected? Did they volunteer?

We have had problems in the past where the outreach and engagement seemed to be somewhat disconnected from the RALO, and although we have said in the past that the RALO should appoint people to the outreach and engagement committee, neither I nor staff could actually find evidence where we have done that in past years. Maybe we've just misplaced the emails, but we could not find that.

And, the last thing is, there are significant activities within outreach and engagement right now related to the IGF meeting to be held in mid-December at Geneva, and it seemed to be less than wise to completely reorganize the committee while that process was going on. Therefore, I have a proposal and some questions and the proposal is first of all, that I'm suggesting that we have two people named by the RALO to be members of the outreach and engagement committee and that at least one of them be a RALO leader, that is Chair, Secretariat, Vice Chair, at the discretion of the RALO. And that whatever we do takes effect in the new calendar year, not immediately.

The questions, however, come up, if we could either scroll the document or allow us to scroll. Thank you. The questions are, do we want to set a leadership structure or do we want to let the group do it themselves? But if there are vice-chairs or co-chairs, one per region, again, does the region select them? Do they self-select? How do we want to go forward in this?

EN

It's really important that the ALAC strongly support whatever we do. I don't have a strong interest in one option or another, but we need to make sure that going forward we do not have disputes between outreach and engagement, which is coordinating things on behalf of the ALAC, but has to be done with the RALOs, and the RALOs, so we don't have any disagreements going forward.

And I'd like to open the floor for thoughts on do you agree on the items that are listed as proposals, and do you have any thoughts on the items to be decided? And I will open the floor. Specifically looking for ALAC members and/or regional leaders with any thoughts on this. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I agree with you on almost everything you wrote. My answer to your question regarding the leadership of the group; I think that even if the group decides to have a co-chair or vice chairs from the region, those people are originally selected by their RALO, so inside the subcommittee they decide who those vice chairs or co-chairs be. Because originally, all those people are selected by their RALOs. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else with any thoughts? This has been an issue of great controversy in the past. Surely someone else has a thought. Olivier, please go head.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks so much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-LeBlonde speaking. I'm one of the co-chairs of the committee.   I'm not quite sure why Dev was mentioned as being chair and co-chair.   I can't quite remember the history about how this all came about, but the five co-chairs have been working pretty well together for the past few years in I think quite a lot of material, a lot of [inaudible].

Now, I do understand there seems to be, at least for some RALOs, some discrepancy between -- or lack of communication between the RALO and the committee itself.   But I'm surprised because of the very large number of members in that subcommittee and for some reason, the information doesn't seem to float one way or the other. So perhaps, it's more of a communication problem than anything else. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. On the chair and co-chairs, I'm simply saying what's on the Wiki, and the Wiki makes it quite clear there is a chair and there are five co-chairs. So, I was just echoing what is there.

The history with outreach engagement has varied over the years.   I recall at least one meeting I was on a few years ago, not this last year, where someone was named as the co-chair for their region because they were the only person on that call from their region, and therefore, the only person to put their hand up was that person. So, it's had a varied history is all I'll say, and I think we need to get on an even keel going forward. Tijani, please go ahead.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking again. Yes, it was a controversial group and why it is not more people to speak about, because you solved everything. You identified the problem. You proposed solutions. That's why I said I agree with you, and I think, from my point of view, the best thing is not to have five co-chairs. If you have five co-chairs, I don't see where the decision comes from. Nobody can have quick decisions, or have more weight in the group. Leaders should lead the group and if you are five leaders, I don't know how it works. But I don't have any problem if the subgroups prefer that, I don't have any preference.

I wanted to say that I am very happy that here we do that. We do a call for membership again and make the RALOs officially appoint their representative in this subgroup. It is important because th subgroup participates in some decision making so it must be representative.

As I told other people, other colleagues, I hope that in the future all the working groups, without exception, should have every year a call for membership and for confirmation of membership, and then it should, how do you say, select their leader. It doesn't seem the guarantee that it can continue, but the group should decide. It's not automatic. I don't agree with a forever chair, a forever leader.

This is not democratic, first, and second, people can be intimidated to say, "Please, why don't we change the chair? If we make it automatic at the beginning of the year, who is our chair?" It will be very good in my point of view. Thank you. We are doing that in our working group, Capacity Building.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, we have instituted that, although it hasn't actually rippled down to the groups. We've just been a little bit too busy after the annual general meeting trying to get all of the details resolved. Olivier, please go ahead, but then I would like to have a comment myself. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. My goodness, Tijani, you touched on a number of issues, so I'll try to take them one by one. First on the issue of having five co-chairs and thus some kind of confused leadership with no clear leader, we do operate in the bottom-line of passion, so the five co-chairs and their traction just keep the trains running on time and to make sure that there is a link back to the RALOs. I really do not believe that there should be a top-down leadership of that working group and indeed of any working group in our community. So that's the first thing.

Then, Tijani mentioned the selection of those people. I'm a little confused because we mentioned that the working group itself should choose its chairs, but the proposal that, Alan, you've come up with is saying that those should be appointed by the RALOs. That's a different thing. Either you have working groups with people that are appointed by the RALOs and appointed by the ALAC, or you have working groups that self-appoint people, so they open membership to everyone and then they self-appoint people to lead the working group.

The concern I have with the current proposal is that the proposal mentions the appointment by the RALOs and by the different component parts such as the ALAC. And therefore, it leaves very little

room for anybody that wishes to take on a leadership position in any of the working groups if we continue by this sort of stance. It actually locks in all the leadership positions to the ALAC and to the RALO leaders, and that's, in my view, not a good thing. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. To be clear, I didn't not propose what the leadership structure is. I put those, are to be decided. I did propose that each RALO named two people, at least one of which is a RALO leader. I didn't necessarily say they act as co-chair, vice co-chair or anything else. I suspect why there was five vice-chairs and a chair in the current structure is you really need somebody to take responsibility for scheduling meetings, for making sure the agenda is updated.

There's a lot of work that a chair or vice-chairs have to do, and I suspect that's why we ended up with a chair and co-chairs in parallel, a structure which doesn't make any sense. Essentially, we had five co-chairs and an executive co-chair or something to run the mechanics. I just think using the term chair in both places makes it a little bit confusing.

So, I think you really do need one person or two people to take responsibility for making sure the mechanics happen, and I don't much care if you call that the Secretariat of the group or the Chair. It sounds like we have strong support for the RALO naming two people. I don't feel strongly that the person named or the leadership person named should be the vice-chair or the co-chair, whatever the title is, I don't hear anyone else having a strong opinion.

So, my only concern I have is if they would pick someone amongst themselves who was not supported by the RALO leadership, we have a conflict there, and that I find problematic, so I will propose a way forward, but first we have some speakers, so I'll turn the queue over to them. Alberto, please go ahead, and then Tijani.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. Well, I do agree with the fact that these people should not be the chair, vice chair/secretary. I mean we should have further participation indeed in LACRALO and this is what I'm suggesting right now, is that the attendance should be not only from people appointed.

I mean, any member of the ALS being a member may participate, so the same should be applied here. I understand that there might be a problem if, for example, that person is not represented by the RALO or the RALO does not support that person in any of the opinions, but this should be resolved by the group chair, and the group chair should also solve the issue of the lack of attendance. I mean, when there are no participants in a group.

That happened in our RALO; we had three persons in one group that were not showing up, so we had to make a decision. And this is something we need to take into account. Thank you.

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

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Several things. First of all, we in At-Large, we decided before that the subgroups should be populated by people appointed by the RALOs. It is the same for the Finance and Budget Subcommittee and it is the same for this subcommittee. If we want to change things, change for what? So, let's be logical. Let's do things in harmony. I don't have any problem to change if you want, we can discuss, we can change.

What is now going on is that the subcommittees have at least two people appointed by the RALOs, and as you said, Alan, I said before that the group selects its leadership, but they must select them amongst people appointed by their RALO. This doesn't mean that -- because the RALO will not appoint only a leader of the RALO. It will appoint one leader, as Alan suggested. It wasn't suggested before, but Alan now is suggesting that, and another one who can be anyone, any member, and the subgroup, any subcommittee is open to everyone.

We don't have meetings closed. All the meetings are open and everyone, even if they are not appointed by their RALOs, they have the right to have a point of view, they discuss, they put on the table new issues, etc., etc. It is not exclusion, but when it comes to make a decision, it is the people appointed by the RALO. This is what was done so far. If we want to change it, I am ready to discuss it, but just think about it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. We are discussing it right now and to be clear, outreach and engagement has not had people appointed by the RALOs

until now. I am suggesting that we do go forward with that, but unlike Finance and Budget, it has not had people appointed by the RALOs before. Perhaps should have, but didn't, and that's been one of the causes.

Alright, I'm going to call the discussion to a close. I don't think we have anymore hands. I will make a proposal to the group, to this group relatively shortly and I believe it will be in the form of the people from each RALO will decide who it is that is their co-chair, vice chair, and it has to be done with the support of RALO leadership, so essentially, the people in the region are going to have to talk to each other, and I hope that won't be too radical an idea, but let me put some words around it and we'll see if it sounds acceptable going forward, and if I can have an action item for me to do that. Thank you.

Next item on our agenda is the At-Large Review. It is a very short report. As you will recall from many discussions past, including those in Abu Dhabi, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee reviewed the Items International Report and reviewed our feasibility document that we provided. They decided that going forward, they would like to see a mapping of the issues identified in the Items International Report, not the recommendations, but the issues, and how they mapped into what ALAC was saying they would do in our feasibility study, and go forward on that.

They have asked MSSI to draft such a document. It was in fact, I believe, drafted and submitted to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee last week, I think. I'm not sure of the timing. The OEC will be meeting

sometime in the first week of December. Let me verify if that is indeed correct.

Yeah, it will be meeting next week, sometime. The timing was not clear last time we asked. We are expecting the OEC to either, number one, turn the report back to MSSI and say it isn't what they wanted, or if it's basically what they wanted, we are expecting based on assurances we got in the open board meeting in Abu Dhabi, the board ALAC meeting in Abu Dhabi, that they will then turn the document over to At-Large, to the ALAC for further modification, verification something or other, and once we complete that, they will then presumably approve whatever we are saying we will implement and pass it on to the board.

That is all a little bit vague. We have not seen the document at this point and we will not likely see it until after the OEC meets. And I don't think I have anything else to report. We are expecting something come back from the OEC possibly in December, possibly not until the beginning of January. Clearly, we will not start much work on it until January, and I'm guessing we were looking at formal approval of whatever comes out of it sometime in the ICANN61 Puerto Rico time frame.

So, we've added a good four or five months onto the schedule that we had originally proposed, and I have no other knowledge of what's going on. I don't know if Holly or Cheryl have either any knowledge or comments. Essentially, from our perspective, nothing has happened since Abu Dhabi.

And Cheryl I see is typing, nothing to add from Holly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not typing about this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and nothing to add from Cheryl because she would have said something right now if she had anything. Then we'll go on to the next item, and that is a proposal to restart working groups. We've been talking about this ad infititum, and I would like to propose something a little bit different if we could have the document up, please.

As we're waiting for it, you will recall over the last number of months, we have several times, last year I would say, tried to restart the gTLD Working Group and the registration issues. The group looking at RDS and WHOIS. We have not been successful in getting it to meet. We have not been successful in finding co-chairs or chairs to run it.

There was a suggestion late in the meeting in Abu Dhabi that instead of trying to do that yet again, we take the one working group which has been successful and the one that we originally were calling an ad hoc working group on the IANA transition, and then it became IANA Transition and Accountability; and with Work Stream 2 we renamed it the ICANN Evolution Working Group. That group meets periodically, gets people up to date on issues, and so far, Olivier has been taking the lead on that, although I'm not sure we can expect him to continue doing that forever.

The proposal is that we have one policy working group that will periodically hold meetings to either discuss issues that are of

importance on one of the issues or another, or simply an update to bring the more general At-Large public up to date on what is going on and specific issues. That we have in addition to that individual mailing lists on the individual subjects, which we have right now but are essentially idle most of the time, and that any meetings that be held are done under the hospices of the single group so we don't need to find five chairs, mailing lists do not necessarily need a chair or a moderator, although they clearly could have should they want.

The benefits are we're not looking for a large number of people and we're not presuming that every each one of these groups meets every week or every two weeks, if there are not issues that are relevant to them. When we do have meetings, we'll have a larger composite audience, because the audience for the working group will be the sum total of all of the working groups, and we'll have mailing lists that can be focused on particular issues so we don't have a lot of detailed mailing going to people who don't have an interest on it.

And I would like to open the floor. This was reviewed by the At-Large leadership. This came up at the very end of the ICANN week. It was discussed by the leadership team on the last day of our meeting and there was a general acceptance saying, "Sounds like it's worth a try. What we've been doing till now isn't working and we clearly must reinvigorate or have a process by which we can have these really important issues discussed by a wider audience than the one or two people who are attending working group meetings or PDP meetings."

We have several speakers. Holly and then, Tijani.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche for the record. I think it's a great idea. I think that one thing, members of the group should identify the issues that they have expertise in or are interested in, and then what the policy group could do is just really take over the issue of policies. And it means that the actual Chair of ALAC doesn't have to worry about it because it's all done, and we don't have to worry about working groups forming and unforming; that you wind up with one group and then just ad hoc groups to identify and deal with issues as they arrive. I think it's great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I find the idea very good. Nevertheless, I want to ask some questions; first of all, you said one mailing list by topic, for example, one for ICANN accountability, one for new gTLDs, etc. And at the end, you can say the working group mailing list is the sum of all those lists.

                                 This is good, but I don't know how it will work. Since we have one list where you have everyone, and since we have only one working group, why do we have separate lists for separate topics? Yes, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: The issue was, the interest areas are still going to be largely driven by your particular interest. So, if you have a great interest in WHOIS issues,

you may not want to participate and receive emails, and if we're successful, there may be a fair number of emails looking at new gTLD issues, and vice versa. So, the concept -- and we still have the ICANN Evolution, we have accountability issues; other issues that will be dealt with will include review teams and things like that.

So, the concept was we'll have a mailing list for each of the subjects, just as it is today. If and when we need meetings, they'll be scheduled through a single, essentially, a single hierarchy, and then you have the issue of how do we announce those meetings? How do we say there's going to be a new meeting held, telling people what it's about, soliciting people to contribute to it perhaps, and therefore, we need a single mailing list for the overall composite group.

Now, whether we try to replicate the individual members of the other mailing lists in a single mailing list or simply have the mailing list that only has five entries in it the names of the other lists, I'm not sure. That's mechanics that need to be determined, but it seems to be a reasonable way going forward. Exactly how it will work, this is an experiment. I don't pretend we fully understand if it will work or how it will work, but that's the overall concept. Is that any clearer, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, it is clearer, but I am afraid we'll make an application. When we call for a meeting, all meetings will be under the hospice of the big working group reform, the policy working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So, the call for meetings will be done through the wide mailing list?

ALAN GREENBERG: The advertising of the meeting, yes correct.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, so if we will discuss new gTLDs, we have to send a new mail from the policy working group to the wide list. That means that even people who aren't interested in new gTLDs will receive this email.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct, but that's a positive in my mind. Because it's really important that even if your area of expertise is WHOIS, you really need to know what's going on in the other areas. That's why, for instance, in Abu Dhabi we had a session dedicated to new gTLDs but everyone was invited, even those who were not active in that group. [AUDIO BREAK]

We'll come back to you, Tijani. Let's go on to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I am fully supportive of this concept. I think it's an excellent idea. My particular biases on this are because I spend an awful lot of time in policy development meetings, and to report back and update a various

plethora of committees is no way near as efficient as this as need be model.

I think what happened with ICANN Evolution as we are now calling it has been a great success. I think the fact that we also use similar things right back in ATRT1, where we had a specific update of interested community members, five people who were in ATRT1. It's a strong model. It's a useful model, and it means that you can very much like the accountability, Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 activities, or indeed the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP Working Group's approach of having work tracks and plenary meetings.

What we're doing, however, is not insisting that work tracks are done because we're allowing the people who are out there in the policy development processes actually doing the work [inaudible] to update our community and to get, most importantly, feedback from our community to take back into their PDP and policy work. I'm just [inaudible]. I also have no problem with the bifurcation into a number of topic based emails, but I do think it's important that summaries and regular reportings do come back to the main lists. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I can virtually guarantee that if we go forward with this, and there seems to be a positive position on it, that the details will change. I can foresee, for instance, the fact that we really need someone to take the lead on new gTLDs, or take the lead on WHOIS, just to, if nothing else, wave a flag saying, "It's time for a meeting."

This is an experiment. I think what we've been doing for the last year or two has not worked very well with the exception of the ICANN Evolution and its predecessors, and I'm suggesting that we try it and if it works, it works, if it doesn't, we'll find out, we'll learn something new about our community, but we're doing better right now at having people involved in policy issues than we have done in a very long time, and I'm suggesting that we capitalize on the inertia, that we're moving forward, and try to make this work.

So, is there anyone who wants to further speak on it, or who feels it's not worth trying? [AUDIO BREAK]

Then if we could have an action item for me to put together a very small group of people to try to implement this as quickly as possible.

Next item on our agenda is ALS Criteria and Application Process. We only have a few minutes to talk about this. We are somewhat behind in our schedule and we only had 10 minutes allocated. And this is the section I was referring to when Tijani was talking before.

My intent right now is not that we try to resolve the issue right now. It is quite clear that the task force we had on ALS Criteria and Expectations got waylaid. The ICANN Accountability and other issues just took complete precedence and has taken an awful lot of time from some of the key people who were participating in that. It is now very clearly within the domain of the At-Large Review Implementation. Assuming things go as we expect, we will have to do a major re-vamp of ALSes and individual members going forward, how they're treated, how we

interact with them. We've been talking a lot about getting messages out to them.

So all of that is going to be part of the implementation. And, a cleanup of the ALS Criteria and Application process is inevitably going to be a part of that. The real question that is on the table today is, do we sit back and wait for the At-Large Review to run its course? And as I said on the earlier item, that looks like we will not be getting even the start of a plan at least until March.

Probably we'll get approval of whatever the board approves in March and it will then take us a couple of months to get our house in order, which means we're deferring this work on the ALS Criteria and the Application process for another, at this point, I would say, optimistically, at least four to five months.

I have been hearing an awful lot of discussion in the group saying this is something of great urgency. We cannot wait. We are having too many applications which some people believe are not necessarily going to be helping At-Large, but will be hurting us, rather than helping. And we should get back onto the track of looking at the ALS Criteria and the Application process in the due diligence and all of those things to make sure that as we add ALSes, we are adding ones that are going to be effective and useful in At-Large.

So, the question on the table right now is, do we want to wait for the At-Large Review to get this process going, or do we want to charter a new process that will be absorbed into the At-Large Review, but can start almost immediately? And I'll open the floor. Tijani, please.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much, Alan. The short answer is no, we don't have to wait. In my point of view, it's very urgent to proceed, to go ahead. As I explained to you, we have now a huge number of applications and we will take [inaudible] very shortly, but I am a little bit hopeful about the fact that we don't have elements to choose only the ALSes that may be more effective in the work. Because several things; as you said, we will not discuss them now, but we need to open this working group in my point of view.
	Second, we are only talking about ALS Criteria. We never spoke about individual member criteria. ALAC was one of the last RALOs who adopted the individual membership. We more or less copied more or less what the other RALOs did with the application form for individual members. But you realize that it is nothing. We don't really know if this guy is really interested in the end users' interests. It is only his affirmation.
	So, we don't have any due diligence, any further investigation. What is that? So, I think that we need to look at the membership in general. We have to test the working group for the whole membership of the RALOs, not only for the ALSes. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you, Tijani. You raised a number of issues, and there's a lot going on in the chat. I'm going to try to address a couple of things in the chat first. There's a comment about only active ALSes should be going to Kobe. The At-Large Summit will not be in Kobe, by the way, it will likely,

at this point, be in Montreal in late 2018. That is assuming we get the budget approved for it. So, just a minor point.

And yes, we will have to discuss the criteria for people attending that meeting, and given that we expect to have significant numbers of individual members who are active and members of ALSes who are active, and you may have multiple people for ALS, that it is going to be a significant discussion. We do have a bit of time because of the delay in the meeting.

Glenn also said if we're going to change ALS expectations that we need to give them a heads up. Well, there has been discussions going on on that and that probably will also be part of the At-Large Review. I don't think that is the priority today. Today's priority seems to be getting the application process in shape. So yes, there will have to be work on that and we will of course give people a heads up and make sure that they understand what they're going to be obliged to do.

I think I'm hearing that we should go ahead, we should try to reform a group, and as someone pointed out, the staff member who is leading that group was Natalie and she's no longer part of At-Large. We will have someone else replacing Natalie in that capacity, probably Evin, but we're going to have to see exactly what the group is doing before we finalize that.

And Judith said, "Alan made a mistake." Which mistake did Alan make? Sorry, 2019. Yes, correct. I did make a mistake. So, do we have any dissent, any disagreement that we should wait for the At-Large Review to catch up with us and defer the work until then?

I hear no comments against it. Alright, in that case, I'm going to be looking -- I chaired the ALS Task Force, and I must admit I didn't put enough time into it which is one of the reasons it sort of died. We will be looking for people to work on this. I'm not going to ask for volunteers on this call, but we will be talking later. If anyone has a great interest in leading this effort or being one of the workers on it, please contact me separately. If we can have an action item, however, for a group to be put together, and I won't specify right now how it be selected.

And we'll go on to the next item in our agenda. Thank you very much. The next item is, again, not a discussion item, but just a heads up. The CROP Review Team has been a great benefit to us or a thorn in our side depending on who you talk to. There has been great disagreement on what the CROP Review Team was supposed to be doing. I'm not sure what is going on the Adobe Connect room, but it doesn't really matter right now. We don't need anything there.

There have been some people calling for the disbandment of the CROP Review Team and simply let RALOs submit their own requests. If they submit good requests, fine, if they submit bad requests they'll get a bad reputation with staff and that's it. And each RALO should keep track of its own applications and track what the benefits are from CROP because benefits are exceedingly important.

Other people believe that there is a great benefit to having the CROP Review Team acting as a coordinating body and as a gate keeper, according to come people, on what should be submitted and what should not be submitted.

And I think, again, from my perspective, it doesn't matter which way we go, but I think we need a decision that is going to be made by the ALAC and supported by At-Large, so that whatever way we go forward, we have a clear -- if there is a CROP Review Team, it has a clear mandate which is accepted and understood by all, or if we go ahead without a CROP Review Team, that we make it very clear what the RALOs' responsibilities are going forward.

The question on the table -- I see we have a number of hands up; the question on the table, does there anyone disagree that we need to relook at the issue and make a formal decision? We have several years of experience with CROP and the review team, and it's now time to decide, do we need to continue, and if so, exactly how? Or do we need to cancel it and revert to some other mechanism?

So, again, I'm not asking for pros and cons or arguments on how to make the decision, but I'd like to know if there is anyone who disagrees that it's about time we made a decision and then accepted it and stopped arguing over the detail issues as we go forward. And I see several hands. We have Tijani, and we have Olivier.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I don't remember anyone who acts to cancel or to remove the review team. People were arguing about the review team shouldn't be a pick up. Shouldn't be something that will make more barriers for applications. This is the only problem. The problem is that some of our group, of our review team think that

EN

they are the deciders. They have to decide whether to make the application go or not go. This is the problem.

I think, in my point of view, the review team is a great thing. It helps us very very well. But it must be clear for everyone that it is to help applicants, not to prevent them or to make another [inaudible] for them, another, how to say, another decision-making step or layer. We need this review team. It is needed to help the applicant. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you, Tijani. All I'm reporting is what people have said to me, and you have to believe me, I'm not going to quote who, there have been people who have said, "It's time to get rid of it. We don't need it anymore." So, as I said, I don't much care. I'm not advocating this, I'm just trying to oversee the process, but I think it's time -- can we please mute whoever that is? I think it's Tijani. Thank you.

What I'm suggesting is it's time to have the discussion of, should we have a CROP Review Team, and if so, exactly what is its mandate? Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And you mentioned in your intro that the RALOs were submitting CROP requests. Actually, they don't. It's the ALSes that can submit CROP requests directly. The way the review team was built, and I totally agree with Tijani on what he said, is to help whoever is filing a CROP request to be

able to fit within a certain set of criteria and to basically make it more likely that their CROP request will be accepted.

One of the requisites is that the CROP requests have to be filed a certain number of weeks in advanced. They have to have a certain number of points made in them, how it aligns with ICANN Outreach and Engagement policy, etc. So, the CROP Review Team itself is made up of people from the Finance and Budget Subcommittee on the one side, and from the Outreach and Engagement Task Subcommittee on the other side in order to be able to help those people.

Now, unfortunately, I think it's been the case that in some cases, some requests have been filed perhaps a bit late on timing, and so there's been a rejection at that point, and well, this will never fly because the Constituency Travel will not have enough time to do with this. So, it's been taken, certainly interpreted that the people that were on this committee were people that were filtering requests out and making decisions on whether requests should move forward or not, and that simply is not the case. It's just the case of making sure it fits within the set boundaries which have been given, and which are clearly labeled on the Wiki. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. You have just provided your opinion on whether the review team should be acting as a gating group or not. Other people clearly believe the opposite. I really don't want to have the debate on this call. We don't have enough time to try to resolve it or to give

people proper opportunity to participate in the discussion. Can I ask staff to please -- thank you.

We have several hands up. All I'm asking at this point is, do we want to make sure that going forward we have agreement that whatever is in place and whatever its mandate is, is a decision that we have formally taken and we will not have to have the disputes going forward when people have their own views of what the group should be doing or should not be doing? I see Tijani and Glenn.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. To answer your question, the group, the review team cannot be, how to say -- because the formal procedure doesn't contains, doesn't include the review team, and to preface that, it is the RALO, those are the PCs, the Program Coordinator from each RALO who submits the request and who attests that the request is okay with all the requirements etc.

So, I think that normally it is the RALO who do that if we don't have this review team, but the review team is helping out. Why do we want it to be restrictive? Why it doesn't exist in their formal for the future? So, I cannot accept, even if it is decided by 100% of the At-Large, that the review team would be a gate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We're hearing various people say that X is true and the next person says Y is true. I think we need to all agree what the process is. Obviously, the ICANN staff people who run CROP are going to have to

agree that it fits in with that they believe is the process, but it's time that we put something in writing so we didn't have different views on what the responsibility of the group is, what the process is for submitting papers.

We've now heard it's the coordinator, we also heard it's ALSes. We also heard it's individuals, and we've heard it's close to RALO. Is there anybody who believes that we should not review this and come to an agreement? Glenn, please go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, in my view, we need to realize that the RT has a function and fundamentally, each of the proposals, and some people are trying to gain the system. Fundamentally, as CROP RTs, we should really see a solid proposal that's tied to the strategic plan with an awareness of the dates. But reality is that doesn't always happen, so fundamentally, we need to read virtually a riot act to anybody who's submitting.

We ran into one incident a little white ago where we had more than one person who wanted to do a trip and we actually developed a process of selecting and short listing the traveler, but that doesn't always work, so I think there are some variants in terms of interpretation, but I think I'm game to the idea of having a re-examination of a process.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I will say that I have been asked to either arbitrate or watch disputes that have been going on now for several years, so I can guarantee, there are differences of opinion as to what

the group should do and what individuals of the group should do. And I think we have to resolve those going forward.

Alright, Glenn, is that a new hand or an old one?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, it's true that someone [inaudible]. Can I get into the queue?

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, you're in the queue. Right now, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alright, Judith Hellerstein for the record. I don't think it's disagreement. I think it is that people are not aware of the rules and why the rules are there, and why exceptions can't be made, and that Constituency Travel has hard and fast deadlines. They always try to ask for extensions of these. And that's an issue. But I think also, they're just not aware of some rules or what the rules are and the reason why the CROP RT was there was, was to make sure that At-Large doesn't look bad by getting so many items rejected.

And that's basically it. It's not that we're voting against ideas. It's that we are saying when you send an application, make sure it's complete, make sure you've explained the purpose, make sure you've written what [inaudible] you're going to do, make sure you have a plan. That's basically what we're asking and why we return ones that have errors or other things wrong with them. It's that simple like that, nothing else, but maybe people reject the idea that they say [inaudible] rejected, but

it's just we want to make sure that At-Large doesn't come out looking bad. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much. We've heard enough comments today that people have different views on what the group should do, whether the group should reject or not, under what conditions the group should return an application, and there's also been significant concern over the amount of time it might take and whether that time causes applications to be refused because of the added time. I think there's enough evidence that this needs to be agreed upon. I'm not 100% sure how we go ahead and convene a group to come up with decisions, but I would like to try going forward.

And again, if we could have an action item that I or someone I designate will come up with a process moving forward.

Next agenda item is Community Onboarding Program and Mentor and Mentee Selection. We are now at the stage where I am told, if I have it correctly, and I'm sure someone will correct me if I'm wrong, that we have two travel slots that we can allocate to a mentor and a mentee or to two mentees if we can provide a mentor who doesn't need travel.

Additionally, we could add a third person who could be a mentee, or another person who could be a mentee, either a second or a third, but there would be no travel allocated for them either. We obviously have five regions. We have a limited number of people. There is some question over how long a mentor or mentee would stay in their position, although the current perception seems to be one year or three

meetings. Any less, some people have said is not worthwhile, any more doesn't allow enough turnover, and since we don't have slots for each region, there is a regional equity issue that is involved here.

Would anyone like to speak to this issue and make a proposal for how we go forward? Travel lists for ICANN61 are going to have to be locked in pretty soon. Olivier has been one of the key people involved in this, so Olivier, would you like to speak first? Tijani has his hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. There has been indeed some extensive discussion already on the mailing list with regards to the selection for mentors and mentees and some suggestions that perhaps we should ask for more than just two funded slots and have maybe one slot for a mentee for each RALO, and perhaps even have more mentors.

Fortunately, I have [inaudible] back with Ergys Ramaj, who is the staff member running this program, and the response has been that the funds are not there this year for us to be able to have more travelers, and not travelers, just more mentees and mentors. But I'm saying travelers because the funding essentially goes over to the travel.

That said, some of the proposals that we've read recently on the mailing list have said that we could actually have five mentees, one mentor or maybe several mentors and then have a rotation of those people traveling to the three ICANN meetings through the year. Or perhaps to have mentors that are already funded by other means, such as being on the ALAC or in the regional leadership and leaving the slots empty just

for the mentee, so having two slots for the first meeting we'd have two mentees.

There's quite a few processes there, but I think that the first thing that needs to be thought about quite carefully now is how we would select the mentors and mentees because that seems to have been, with the history of the committee on boarding project, the point of discord, there was a big question mark as to how the current mentor and mentees, the pilot project ones were selected, which did not involve the RALOs, did not involve the ALAC. They were staff selected, but this was a test thing, so now we've got a more production CROP and we need to have our own way to select it, and this has been well received and well understood by the staff running the program itself. I think that's all I can say at the moment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. At this point, we have two travel slots that we have to identify very very shortly for the meeting in Puerto Rico, and the question is do we have a proposal on the table to go forward and do that? If not, how do we come to closure on a proposal very quickly?

I think, from my perspective, I'm quite happy if we have the two or three or four people who are active in this area come up with a proposal, present it to the ALAC. I have no doubt it will be accepted, but we still need to put something in writing and quickly, otherwise we're not going to have any people traveling to Puerto Rico on this program. Tijani, your hand is up, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. Very positive evolution of the onboarding program. The first round, if I can say that, was done exclusively by staff and there was arbitrary choice of mentor/mentees etc., etc. Now we are involved in the choice of the mentees and the mentors. It is a very very positive evolution.

Now, we have two slots, and I am happy also to learn that we can use the two slots for mentees, since Olivier, who is the mentor, and I hope he will continue to give the mentor, is already funded. So it is a very good thing.

The best is to have five slots. As the GNSO people, they have one per constituency. So, we need to have one per constituency too, and we have five constituencies in ALAC in At-Large, but now we have only two slots, and two slots in my point of view, first the program; how do we conceive the program?

Some people are saying, "Yes, we'll take more than one or more than two mentees and everyone will come one meeting and the next meeting will be another one and the next meeting will be another one." I don't see that this is program in this case. It's disconnected. It's not a continuous program.

Olivier said, "The program is not only the meetings." Yes, you are right 100%, but you know very well, Olivier, better than me, what you do during the meetings is handled [inaudible] better and more productive than what you do virtually. So it is both. It is yes, we need to have teleconferences or chats with the mentor between the meetings and several times between the meetings according to a program, but also

we need those meetings to make people see exactly what is happening and also to make these people understand they speak with you directly, which is more productive.

So, in my point of view, the program should be shaped in this way. When you take a mentee, he has to continue at least one year to be a mentee, and since we have two slots, we may have two mentees this year, and in this case we'll have two regions I think their mentees on this program. And next year, we'll take two others if they will keep giving us only two, but if we manage to have five, it will be better. And in this way, we will make [inaudible] onboarding program, not a program which is disconnected pieces here and there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We are officially out of time in this meeting. We still have one other agenda item that is critical that we have to do before everyone starts dropping off this call. We have two speakers right now, and so far I have not heard any proposal on how we go forward and actually resolve this issue, which has to be resolved in the next week or two. If we don't have any proposals, I will make one. Alberto, please go ahead, and please be brief.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. My proposal is that this time, the two slots are used for mentees and the mentors should be those who already have funding, but as Tijani and Olivier have said, it should be clear that this is not the best way, and for Panama, I think we will only

have two slots because we are within the same budget. Unless, there is a program that has moveable funds so to call them.

But we need to fight for the next budget to have more slots, both for mentors and mentees. And this should be mentors that are not within the programs that already have funding for travel. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Beran.

BERAN DONDEH: Thank you, Alan. This is Beran for the record. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

BERAN DONDEH: Okay. So my thought is, and I just came up with a proposal, and the proposal is that for the five regions to all have participated within that one year frame of the program. You suggested that the regions where the meetings are being held, the mentees from those regions would attend those meetings physically and then they would get another funding for probably the ones that were identified. But I'm liking this idea of getting the mentor to be an already funded At-Large member and then just having the two slots for the mentees.

But either way, the proposal basically if we get all the regions involved within that one year frame. We could have two at any meeting, at the

first two meetings, every meeting. For the first two meetings, we'll have two mentees attending those meetings, and then the last meeting we will have one mentee attending, so that would be a total of five mentees attending from the five different regions.

We also need to take into consideration, going back to what Tijani said about maybe having a choppy mentor/mentee relationship. This Onboarding Program is not supposed to be meeting specific. It supposed to be a program that is supposed to take a mentee from join At-Large all the way to staying engaged within At-large, and not necessarily having to attend every single meeting within that year for this to happen.

So, taking that into consideration, maybe we should -- this is the proposal that we have; that was why we have this kind of a proposal, because we're not taking into consideration that the mentee has to attend every single ICANN within that one year for them to stay involved.

So, during the course of that year, you would still stay connected with those mentees, that mentor would still stay connected with those mentees through Skype calls, through webinars and all of that. And they would be encouraged to also attend these meeting remotely, the ones that don't attend physically the meetings. That's the proposal that we have. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A couple of points. Number one, we've heard in the last few minutes that it is not important to attend multiple

meetings, and it is important to attend multiple meetings, so we have a difference of opinion there. Clearly, we are not going to get a lot of mentees through this program in this fiscal year. And lastly, I will point out that assigning a mentor who is not really interested in doing it and willing to put significant time into it at the ICANN meeting and outside of the ICANN meeting makes it a useless program.

We have lots of experience of people volunteering or being volunteered to be a mentor and then do not follow through, so I think that's really really critical.

I'm not sure how we picked the people we're looking at now in the next week or so, and that was the question on the table. I will speak to people over the next couple of days and try to come up with something, try to have someone come up with something that is acceptable.

If anyone is interested in working on this program and trying to make a recommendation for how we go forward within the next few days, please send a message to me and to staff saying you are so interested.

Olivier, please go ahead, but be very brief. We are very much out of time and we have one other item which is related to this that must be covered.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: This is Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just one thing. I think that judging from the discussions online, the one thing that most people if not all of the people accepted was that the actual selection should be made by the At-Large Selection Committee. So, that might just be one

thing that you can put down as having agreements with. The rest, yeah, needs to be worked out, Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Noted. Any further comments on this?

Beran, I assume that's an old hand?

BERAN DONDEH: Yes, it is. Apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Alright, I will do something going forward. You can put an action item saying Alan will do something going forward. And I'll expect someone to be able to interpret that for me and tell me what it means.

The last item on the agenda is ICANN61. Gisella, do you have anything you need to say to this group before I go on to item B, which is additional travelers?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, this is Gisella for the transcript, and I thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please look at the transcript. I don't know what that means.

ABDULKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Alan, can I make a quick comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: Who is saying that? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, Gisella said nothing to add from her. We have additional travelers that we are funded for, at least to -- please mute whoever is causing that noise, please.

We have additional travelers, two of which are funded by ICANN for people who are involved in policy activities. We may well have other people.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Alan, please. It's Sebastien speaking. You have someone from Africa who wants to talk. The communication seems to be very weak, but he wants to talk. Just try to help to make his comments, please. I don't know who it is. I don't know what he wants to say, but I think there is somebody asking for the floor. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Sebastien, that is correct. And as soon as I finish talking, he will get the floor.

ABDULKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE:I'm sorry if my connection is bad. I just wanted to comment on the mentor/mentee.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead. Can you introduce yourself, please?

ABDULKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: My name is Abdulkarim Oloyede. I just want to find out, how do you determine a mentee?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what we need to figure out.

ABUDLKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Okay. Is there any suggestion regarding who are mentees and how long a mentee needs to be before they become a mentee, and what [inaudible] you have to have to be a mentor?

ALAN GREENBERG: We do not have any rules right now. That is the reason we are discussing it.

ABUDLKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wish I could give you simple answers, but I don't have them.

ABUDLKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Probably if I have suggestions, I should probably send you emails or something like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: There will be discussions going on. Olivier, are there discussions going on in Outreach and Engagement or in some other venue?

ABUDLKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Okay, that's fine. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, it's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. There is a discussion with the Secretariat mailing list, the ALAC mailing list, and the Outreach and Engagement mailing list.

ALAN GREENBERG: So the only place that other people can participate in is Outreach and Engagement. Then I will ask you to the extent possible, use that list so other people can join that list if they wish to.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If you wish to join, let staff know. staff.atlarge@icann.org.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, Abdulkarim, if you wish to participate in the discussion, you should be on the Outreach and Engagement mailing list.

ABUDLKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Sorry, can you please tell again how if I want to participate?

ALAN GREENBERG: You send a message to the staff. You get plenty of messages from At-Large staff. Send a message back to them saying you want to be on the Outreach and Engagement mailing list. [AUDIO BREAK]

ABUDLKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: That's fine. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Back on to the additional travelers for ICANN61. We have sent out a call for people who are interested. I believe that went out today. The deadline is next Friday. That deadline is also the deadline at which we are supposed to have the names in to Constituency Travel. We obviously will not make that deadline.

The process that was followed for ICANN60 was the chairs of the RALOs were the selection group to select the additional travelers in priority order, and last time we had a longer list than we had slots, but as we went forward because of travel cancellations, we ended up using all of the selectees.

EN

I would like to propose that we use the same methodology this time, that the selection be done by the chairs of the RALOs in conjunction with the ALAC chair, but to a large extent, the RALOs are the ones who lead the issue. Is there any objection to that?

I see no objection, I hear nothing. Does this group believe, and I'm asking the ALAC explicitly right now, does this group believe that the ALAC has to ratify these selections, or can we leave it up to the chairs? For other selections of travelers, we always give the discretion to the chairs, but do you believe the ALAC must make the final, formal approval, or can we leave it up to the chairs? That will take a few days off of the process.

 ALAC members, is there anyone who objects strongly to the chairs being delegated the responsibility for selecting?   We have several comments leaving it up to the chairs. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. May I suggest that if it's the chairs who make the selection, that leaves the chair of ALAC saying that there is something who is not going well or disagrees strongly, just go to the ALAC. He's the one who makes the final cut on that. Thank you. Another chair or the chair. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm quite willing to have the ALAC to do that on behalf of the ALAC. I will put forward a consensus call giving me that authority since I don't have it otherwise, but that can be done in parallel with the

applications coming in, Sebastien. I thank you for that. And if we can have an action item for me to do a consensus call on that process.

In that case, we have completed our work, is there anyone with any other business? Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking again. I'd like to understand the process because now I am confused. Are the RALO chairs who select the people, and if there is a problem, they come to you and you will arbitrate, or is it otherwise?

ALAN GREENBERG: The process we used last time was, I convened a meeting of the RALO chairs and communally we made a decision on who the selected travelers were. Certainly last time, because of the lack of people who actually had policy experience, it was a relatively easy process. I'd almost like it to be a harder process this time because we have more options, but that was the process. Last time we went back to the ALAC for ratification.

What Sebastien has proposed is, at my discretion, either I approve it on behalf of the ALAC or that I go back to the ALAC if I feel there is any something controversial. The entire process I will outline in the consensus call in parallel with getting in the applications. Tijani, if you still have your hand up, and Olivier, go ahead. [AUDIO BREAK]

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond. On any other business, just a quick thing regarding the Internet Governance Forum that is taking place in a couple of weeks time in Geneva. The deadline for people to register if you're attending was today. Unfortunately, there were a lot of people that still haven't registered and thought they could register on site. In fact, they can't.

So, now the deadline has been extended until, I believe it is the 4th of December, which is next Monday, and you absolutely, if you are going to attend in person, you absolutely have to register. If you don't, you will not gain access to the UN compound. They require all the details to be provided in advance because it is a high-security location. That's all.

Apart from that, all the preparations for this are going really well. Glenn and I are leading the show on this. We've got food, all sorts of brochures etc. that will take place. We also have some goodies, which we won't tell you about. If you need to know about them, email us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Is there a link that we can provide for the registration? [AUDIO BREAK]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. Yeah, I will put that into the chat. I've put it in to the At-Large community Skype chat earlier today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And for those of you who are not familiar, we have a lot of people on this call; shortly after this meeting, you can go to the agenda for this meeting and there will be a pointer to the chat box, so anything put into the chat box will be captured and you can refer to it later. You don't have to do it before you log off here right now. So that URL is now there forever, and if you plan to register, as Olivier said, there's a very short window in which case you can keep on registering. Thank you, Olivier, for bringing that to our attention.

Any further items?

Then I thank you very much. This has been an exceedingly well attended meeting. I think we've accomplished a lot. I'm not happy with the number of action items I have, but that's my own fault, and thank you all and I hope you have a good rest of your day. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, everyone. The meeting has now been adjourned. The audio will be disconnected. Please do remember to disconnect your Audio from the Adobe Connect room. Wishing you all a wonderful morning, afternoon, or evening wherever you may be. Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]