

GISELLA GRUBER:

Good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Tuesday, 23 January 2018, at 04:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Seun Ojedeji, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Kaili Kan, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Abdulkarim Ayopo, Ali Hussein, Vernatius Ezeama, Barrack Otieno, Bram Fudzulani, Leon Sanchez, Amrita Choudhury, Satish Babu, Howard Deane, Judith Hellerstein, [Barrack Otieno,] Evan Leibovitch.

On the Spanish channel, I don't believe we have anyone at this moment. On the French channel, we have Aïcha Abbaad. We don't have anyone on the Russian channel.

Apologies noted from Dana Perry, Ricardo Holmquist, and Alberto Soto.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Yesim Nazlar, Evin Erdogan, Siranush Vardanyan, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

Our French interpreters this evening are Claire and Jacques, Spanish interpreters Claudia and Veronica, and Russian interpreters Ekaterina and Yulia.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels, and this every time you do speak. And also, if you could speak at a reasonable speed to allow for [inaudible] interpretation.

---

*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.*

---

And also Justine Chew has just joined us on the Adobe Connect.

Thank you very much, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Gisella. Does anyone have any other business to add to near the end of the agenda? Then we will accept the agenda as displayed in the Adobe Connect and online.

I'll note this is a rather unusual meeting today. The last part of the meeting is an in camera session. In camera is a term which means it is a private meeting. It will be for the ALAC. [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

I didn't hear who was speaking there. To continue, [inaudible].

ALI HUSSEIN:

Ali Hussein from [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The last part of the meeting will be a private meeting to include just ALAC members, regional leaders, and the other advisors to the ALAC leadership team. So once we get to that part of the agenda, anyone else who is not part of that group will be asked to leave. That

---

meeting is not recorded, but we will report on exactly what the end result was, if there was a result of it.

With that, we'll start. The first item on the agenda is a zero minute one, which is the report on review of action items that are outstanding. Since Heidi put in zero minutes, I'm assuming there are no action items that require the action or involvement of the ALAC. Is that correct, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That is correct. I'm happy to report that all action items have been completed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Wow. That rarely happens.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It does.

ALAN GREENBERG: Usually, we manage to add more ones, before the others get completed that is.

The first substantive item, therefore, on the agenda is the ALAC policy and development activities. I presume Evin will be reporting on that. Is that correct?

---

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Yes. Hello, Alan. Thank you very much. As you all know, we've had five statements approved by the ALAC recently listed on the agenda. Statements in process, we have three currently being drafted. The first one, if you'd like to go over, Alan, is the ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update, as recently requested by Göran Marby, the CEO. He is calling for a community comment on this. So far, we have Tijani who has volunteered. I'm not sure if other penholders would like to be assigned.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Tijani has volunteered over the last several years to take the lead on this, and I'm delighted that he has done so again. Certainly, you can include me as one of the potential people working with Tijani on it and if there are any other volunteers, they can volunteer now or let us know as we go along.

This is going to be an interesting year in ICANN, probably the first of several interesting years. It is the first year in a while or perhaps ever where we are forecasting either stable or decreasing income. And we're forecasting it for perhaps several years to come. That implies several things. In theory, it just means you have to reduce perhaps a little bit or not grow. The reality, of course, is that you always have new things that you have to do. And therefore, if you don't have increasing income, you have to find things to stop doing so that the new things that have come up for one reason or another are going to be able to be funded.

---

For instance, if you look at the coming year, we are going to have WHOIS related costs, whether it's related to GDPR or something else, and of course those have to be funded.

So it's going to be a challenge, and very often the easiest things in a budget to cut are the ones that we may – certainly we as a group within ICANN – are least likely to want to see cut. So I think we're going to have to pay a lot of attention to this budget, to this document and in fact the ones over the next year or two to come and be sure that if we have concerns, we are vocal and express them carefully.

Would anyone else like to comment on this? As I said, I think it's going to be a really both interesting and – well, I'll leave it and say interesting – time. Leon, do you have any thoughts on this? As our board member, I suspect you're going to be somewhat involved in how ICANN manages to go through the next couple of years. You don't have to have any thoughts.

LEON SANCHEZ:

I guess we'll see. No, I actually have no comments at this point. But yes, it should be interesting to see how the organization manages to struggle with the challenges.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone else would like to make any comments or volunteer to work on this? Cheryl says she'll have a comment when she gets to her GNSO report.

All right, Evin, let's go on to the next item then.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. The next statement being drafted is Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. It closes its comment on 1 February. I didn't have an assigned penholder but noted that the ALAC did want to comment on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, there was no assigned penholder. Sebastien, who as many may know led the effort to create the new meeting strategy a number of years ago, has put a comment in as a first draft. I think the optics are somewhat bad if the only person within At-Large to comment is the person who as a board member led the effort. And I'm not sure we would all agree on these issues. Is it correct Sebastien is not on this call? I see he's not highlighted, so I'm assuming he's not.

The comment that Sebastien drafted, some of the points I agree with, some of them I don't agree with, and some I don't quite understand. I think Maureen or somebody said they also don't understand the last two comments. I'm not quite sure who said that, but I tend to agree with it. I also have some concerns over his treatment of the AGM type meeting where he is asking for an eight-day meeting, which I don't think anyone else has the stomach for at this point.

Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I would like to volunteer also to help in this statement if you don't mind.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

I certainly don't mind, and I would suggest that as soon as possible. This one closes pretty soon. It closes on 1 February. So I would suggest that working from a base of the statement that Sebastien did write or at least the notes he provided, that you comment on what you agree with, what you disagree with, or anything else that you think is relevant to this discussion. I'll certainly do the same. But I think we're going to have to work pretty quickly on this.

And I think it's really important to make sure that people who were not part of the new meeting strategy group – and, Tijani, I think you were actually. So your opinions are still important, but I think we really need to make sure that we're not just echoing what was said last time.

Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thanks very much, Alan. Before posting the comment, Sebastien did send me a copy and did send me something with the last two paragraphs that were more cryptic than currently. So the intent with the last two paragraphs – and I'll read them to you and then I'll explain them to you:

“During the policy forums, six or seven sessions of two hours are set up in parallel and organized by each linguistic community in their own language.”

What he is basically saying is that there should be a public forum in each language, each of the ICANN six official languages, taking place in

---

parallel in a separate room for each one of the communities. Either in parallel or one after the other. And same regarding the AGM as well so that the five session of two hours would be set up in parallel. So the policy forum might not need to be taking place in parallel, but the AGM would be able to take place in parallel and would be organized and would be separated. So it's not like you'd have just interpretation in the main room with everyone talking and being referenced into English, I guess, being the basic language.

Does that make sense?

ALAN GREENBERG:

A little bit. His wording is very clearly both of them are to be held in parallel.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Ah, so there you go. So there would be a different discussion in six rooms in parallel.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. By the way, you said a public forum. I don't think you meant that because public forum normally means that the board is sitting there and comments on things, and I don't think that was either in – that certainly is not what Sebastien said there and there was nothing to imply that it would be before an audience of the board but would simply be an opportunity for people to speak to each other either in their own language or in the AGM in their own region, among their own region.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm just interpreting what's written at the moment. It does say, "During the public forum, six or seven sessions..."

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it says, "During the policy forum."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, the policy forum. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Policy forum, which is the name of that meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Apologies. Yes, sorry. So, no, the public forum is still the same, but the AGM sessions would be set up in parallel.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, anyone have any thoughts on this? I have some personal thoughts. Among other things, the North American and European meetings would be rather large, and so would the English one. It depends whether we call Australian English or not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You don't.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [That would be] rather large.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank, Alan. And, no, we definitely don't classify Australian as anything other than Australian. And we find ourselves in an APAC zone, so perhaps we're closer to Hindi or something else.

I honestly cannot support this parallel session concept. I think that the interpretation services that we have with the language services that we already get in these meetings has allowed for a gradually increasing – and I'm not saying it's where it needs to be yet, but it has been gradually increasing – meeting of the needs of people to speak in their own language and for people like me to read a real-time captioning providing that there is the English channel going to the captioners.

So I just can't support the parallel language services concept, and I certainly can't support it – I mean I absolutely cannot support it – in a situation where we are going to have to fight tooth and nail for any budget expenses to be increased as opposed to decreased. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                      Anyone else have any comments?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        Alan, if I may?

ALAN GREENBERG:                      Yes, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        Hello again. I also wondered and said but wait a minute. Does this mean that you're going to get a lot more interpretation? The response was when it comes down to the regional sessions – so the five sessions of two hours set up in parallel for each of the regions – then you would only have the same interpretation system as you would have now because none of the regions apparently are requiring [inaudible] interpretation.

On the policy forum, for each one of the six or seven – take six languages for example, six language communities – his point was that there was not going to be any interpretation at all. So the language community that was speaking in Spanish would be having its session in Spanish, and the language community speaking in French would have its session in French, and the one in English would have it in English, etc.

ALAN GREENBERG:                      Thank you, Olivier. I guess my question is if we were to ask for this, I would want to see a rationale for, what are we trying to accomplish

---

with them? What problem are we trying to solve? I'm not sure what it is. I can certainly understand that those who are speaking one of the less common languages in ICANN might have something to discuss amongst themselves that is relevant. But since we also have a vast majority, for instance, who speak languages such as English, and that may include people from Thailand and Japan, I'm not quite sure what the motivation is.

Therefore, we are taking a very significant number of people out of the equation unless someone has a real strong rationale for what problem is it we're trying to fix or what end product are we trying to generate. I'm not sure I know what it is, and certainly from these descriptions I don't.

So I would certainly have trouble with those particular items as I would with his comment on the AGM pointing out that the original meeting strategy was not looking at that meeting as a seven-day meeting but as an eight-day meeting. I don't think there's a lot of taste in ICANN right now for adding an eighth day onto a seven-day meeting, which among other things eats into two full weekends and a few days of the business week.

Cheryl says, "Quite the opposite. Yes, there is some demand for shorter weeks, not longer." So I certainly have some problems with the draft statement that was provided, and I'll add my comments to the wiki. But if we're going to make a comment at all, then I think we're going to need some people to pull this together and perhaps have a quick teleconference sometime in the next week or so.

All right, let's go on to the next item, Evin.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. The last statement being drafted currently is Data Protection and Privacy Update – Community Feedback on Proposed Compliance Models. Holly has instigated a lot of e-mail traffic on this, and I've marked her as a penholder. Anyone else who would like to volunteer as penholder, please let me know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm not sure we're at the penholder stage yet with this one. We're certainly having an interesting discussion. Part of it, I think, is at cross purposes for two different reasons. The first one is accidentally Holly moved some of the discussion onto the ALAC internal list and instead of being held on the public list, some of the interventions were on the private list. I don't know if they've all been transcribed here or even if it's proper to transcribe something from the internal list onto this. But that's a little bit of a problem.

The other problem is we are having people weighing in saying which model do they like, and my understanding is these models were presented as either extremes or concepts that people may want to consider. But what we are looking for going forward is not to select Model 1, 2A or 2B, or 3, but to come up with a model which meets our end targets. So the challenge at this point is now not to say which model you think is best but to start looking for characteristics and what do we want as the end result.

So I think we have to look at it from that perspective, and that's a more difficult job than just picking from four different models. But the bottom

---

line is, and if you read the Hamilton memos, they start off saying ICANN's ideal end world is to exactly what we're doing right now. It would be nice to keep on following our current policy, following the agreement we struck with the U.S. government when the AoC was written and just continue what we're doing, but that's impossible. That is not going to be able to happen. Therefore, how do we move to something different and how do we try to minimize the harm on all possible sides?

That's the challenge we have right now, and we have it with a very short deadline. I believe any comments are due on the 29<sup>th</sup>, I think, which is exactly a week from now. So we don't have an awful lot of time to try to coalesce this discussion into something useful.

Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

As I say, I think we have a very short space of time, and that's the 29<sup>th</sup>. I appreciate there may be some flexibility, and the reason that I started to comments with [inaudible] some general principles, which is recognizing this interim is going to be a long time so it should be something we're comfortable with, recognizing that it ought to be a global model because you don't know when your customers are going to no longer be the European Union or they are going to become European Union.

In terms of what we have in place, I just don't think we have the time to pick and choose the elements. So I think coming up with saying something like "a model comes closest to what we have been talking

---

about for a long time because X” is the best we can do in the timeframe. I didn’t realize there were models out until whenever I started this discussion. But I think we should probably say at least this is the model that comes closest to what we’ve been saying for a long time, and these are the considerations that we have.

[I] was just on an APAC call that both Maureen and Cheryl were on. Another APAC member who is involved in the registrar in China pointed out there’s another issue about, how is this going to be enforced? My understanding is basically Compliance has to come up with, what are we going to enforce of the RAA and what are we not? Because that’s the question. As you would know, it’s going to be a long time before we actually change the RAA. We have to start, we go through PDP processes with that twice. Then we have to go through negotiation.

So the interim is a long interim, and I think the best contribution we can make is as a matter of principles these are the things that we support, recognizing that this is not a final model and never can be. With those words, I think we’ve got to say something at this stage, and that’s the framework.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Anyone else have any comments? I certainly agree that we have to say something. Holly’s last statement I think captures what I think we have to say. We have to say what is important to us. Since my understanding from a number of senior people in ICANN is that what we are – and in fact, Göran’s blog message says that – we are trying to find

---

what characteristics do we want in our new model. And they have tossed out these four models as examples.

I think our challenge is to identify what are the characteristics that are important to At-Large. Remember, we are not the privacy commissioners and we are not the intellectual property constituency. We're looking out for what is important to end users, and that includes registrants. I think our challenge is where do we come down on which of these models and characteristics of models are the important aspects to us and to the community whose interests we're representing.

I think if we can start listing those and identifying those, and disagreeing with each other perhaps, we may end up coming to closure pretty quickly on it. I'd like to hope we will, but that remains to be seen. But I think it's going to take some concerted effort of people to really think about this and look at how do we want WHOIS to be working for the next year or two years because that's what we're talking about. And are we willing to accept the repercussions of making this decision?

Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I tend to agree with Holly on everything because I don't think we will find the final solution in a few months and it will be an interim period [in between that] solution. I think that this needs [a lot of] [inaudible] among us. We didn't discuss it deeply. So we have now tomorrow on 24<sup>th</sup>, we have a webinar on GDPR. The Capacity Building working group has a webinar on that. I hope that there will be a lot of discussion on it in the webinar.



---

Also, we will have another webinar, two other webinars in fact, [on the same day] organized by I don't know who organized it. I am registered for one of them. I hope that several of us will be registering for it so that we understand every point of view expressed by the others and then we come back and have one [inaudible] call about this issue so that we discuss it [inaudible] together. Because now everyone has his point of view, and I think we have similar points of view, but we need to discuss them deeply before taking a final decision. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

But recognize we're looking for a final statement on Monday. By the way, two of the GDPR sessions are overlapping, unfortunately. The ones on Wednesday. Not our planning, but that is the way it worked out.

Leon, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Only 30 minutes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I understand. Leon, please go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ:

I'm pretty much in agreement with what you've all said. I just think it's important that the ALAC considers that this is mostly a compliance issue at this stage, and it will surely evolve into maybe a policy issue later on. I think that it would also be useful that you ask from the organization to

---

establish a timeline so that this interim doesn't go on forever. There is a saying that says that there is nothing more permanent than what is temporal. So I guess we just need to ask the organization to have a clear timeline on after implementing this interim model, whatever it is that the organization decides to implement. What are the next steps and what would be the time to get the final or the definitive solution to comply with GDPR? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, thank you, Leon. You do realize, of course, that it's not the organization that has to do with but it is a GNSO PDP, and I would like to know how we set timelines on that.

LEON SANCHEZ:

I agree with that, but at this stage, Alan, as far as I understand it is [due to] a compliance issue that will of course [derive] on a PDP and that will be another stage. So what I would like to convey here is that this seems to be a two-stage process. The first one to choose an interim model so that the compliance issue may be addressed in the short time, and this of course will have other implications as you quite well signal that may end into a GNSO PDP process.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, Leon, I think it's really important that we make clear to everyone on this call what we mean by this is a compliance issue. The current situation is we have a policy that says all information in WHOIS is completely public. We know that is not viable for compliance with

---

GDPR. Therefore, what we are thinking right now – and we also know we cannot change the policy quickly because that does require a PDP. It's ongoing. It has been ongoing for almost two years at this point, and we do not see the end in sight. And that's not funny, whoever is laughing, but that is the reality.

Therefore, the organization is now in a position of saying we cannot change the policy, we cannot live with the current world as it is right now, and therefore we are choosing what parts of the policy we will close our eyes to and not enforce and exactly how will we not enforce certain parts and other parts we will do. We're trying to decide which parts to enforce. That's why it's a compliance issue. For better or worse, it's going to go on until we do have a better solution or until the board acts to put in place a temporary policy solution, which they are empowered to do under certain circumstances. So the issue of it being compliance means we are trying to decide which parts not to enforce of the current policies, and that's the challenge we have right now.

And we have, as we've said, less than seven days to come up with a definitive statement. I don't think we're going to build a model in those days within our group, and therefore I'm suggesting that what we want to do is emphasize what are the characteristics of the model that we value most. I would strongly suggest we look at it from that perspective.

In any case, we have to go on with the meeting at this point. We have a lot to do, and we're running very late at this point. Evin, what do we have next on the policy? And then I'd like to close this discussion.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. There is a new public comment request to which the ALAC needs to make a decision, which is Maximal Starting Repertoire, Version 3 (MSR-3) for Root Zone Label Generation Rules. That comment closes on the 26 February.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have always for a very long time said we are not going to comment on IDN technical statements, so I think unless someone has a strong reason for reversing that practice right now that we will not comment on that one. I open the floor if anyone feels we should be commenting. Then that decision is made.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Great. Thank you, Alan. That's it from my end.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It stays with you now with a very brief and quick review of ALS and individual members.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. I'll be fast. We have three new ALSes as of today, and they're all coming from the AFRALO region: ISOC Madagascar; ISOC Gambia; and Habaka, which is also in Madagascar. We will decide I think on the decertification of five NARALO ALSes, which are listed on the agenda page. We also have a vote closing tomorrow on the certification of an APRALO ALS applicant based in Yemen. We also have, scrolling down, an individual new member from the NARALO region, Adrian Schmidt. He's

---

also featured in the NARALO newsletter. Upcoming, we will have a LACRALO orientation call. We will be working with the RALO manager, Silvia, as well as the LACRALO leaders to potentially schedule a call in February.

That's it for me from my end.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Evin. Any questions for Evin? Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, Evin. Also, don't we have an ALS in LACRALO that's in due diligence?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yes.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Where is that stated? Where is that?

EVIN ERDOGDU: We're waiting on regional feedback, not from the RALO but internally from staff, a GSE VP that's responsible for that region. I noted that that's also from Ruben. I believe he's a former indigenous ambassador. So I expect that application will proceed smoothly through due diligence, but we're waiting on some feedback.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Thanks so much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anything further? Then we will go on to the next item, which is reports from largely liaisons. It's an opportunity for anyone to give a report, but in general all reports are provided in writing and this is an opportunity to highlight anything which is particularly important. I see Julie says nothing to add, and I noticed Cheryl earlier said she does have something to add so I'll turn it over to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. As I informed the leadership team [since my last report], our next meeting of the GNSO Council is later this month on 30 [November]. I just clarified with the leadership team a couple of things regarding what was in the last council meeting in terms of some of their resolutions.

But since then, however, we've had the publication internally – I don't believe they've been posted so they're not final yet – of a number of statements that will be coming out in public comment from the GNSO Council. It's the one from the point of view on the incremental changes to the ICANN meeting strategy that I find very disturbing.

Let me read. It's a seven- or eight-pager, so I'm only going to read you less than a paragraph. But this bothers me, and I think you'll see why I said it can link to several of our discussions earlier on. Here we go. It says:

---

“At a time when ICANN had a shortfall in the reserve fund in the order of \$80 million and both the ICANN CEO and Chair have put the community on notice that they are actively looking for ways to save money, it seems that it is time to consider how ICANN meetings could be streamlined or managed in order to reduce the considerable cost attached to producing each meeting.

“For example: using regional hubs on a regular basis” – we’ve heard that before, nothing exciting, that’s my intervention there rather than constantly searching for new locations.

Secondly, and this one is my alarm bell, “reviewing the requirement to have all meetings recorded, transcribed, and translated.” Doesn’t make me feel warm and fuzzy.

The next one almost makes me perhaps even more irritated than nervous, “reassessing whether three major ICANN meetings each year are necessary, particularly in the light of other ICANN sponsored meetings, such as” – and this is my intervention, do listen carefully to these ones, won’t you, close my intervention – “as the GDD Summit....”

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Cheryl?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Apparently.

---

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Alan. I'm just checking with our operator.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What's up? What? Couldn't you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we thought you were going to pause and then go on to the next one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Those things bother me greatly, and I think we need to pick up on them and Finance and Budget need to think about it, Meeting Strategy needs to think about it. And based on what I know that the APAC hub will be coming in the Puerto Rico meeting with a statement to increase and not have carved out with any financial expenditure reduction anything to do with language diversity and language services, we really have to be careful. But those, GDD and NCPH and DNS, it's just a GNSO exercise. It bothered me. I wanted to pass it on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, we heard GDD, but we didn't hear the other ones. Your line went silent at that point. That's why we were asking had we lost you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, it was GDD, the Non-Commercial Party House Intersessional, and the DNS Symposium – all [purely] GNSO.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Exactly, and that's clearly all that counts from their perspective. I think clearly the answer is then we should eliminate the costs associated with these meetings that cater to only a tiny part of the community. I see no one clapping, but all right. Thank you, Cheryl. When is this? This paper is going to be released when?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's the public comment to go in. It will be finalized at the meeting on 30 January, so it will be shortly after or even on 30 January.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and when are the comments due on that public comment? It says 1 February. Okay, so they're giving us 12 hours to comment on their comment, if we're lucky. I think that says we need to at the very least say we strongly support the overall concept of continuing with our three meetings a year and tailoring each one as appropriate. That just adds reinforcement to say we have to work on that statement and get something issued on it. So thank you, Cheryl.

Olivier, did you have any comment? I know you have put a number of comments in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks, Alan. No specific comments, but it is quite bothering to see this type of comment from the GNSO that should know better, and that's all I'll say.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Having spent eight years on the GNSO Council, all I can say is things have changed in recent years without any more editorial comment as to why or how this has happened. Any further reports anyone wants to make?

Then we will next go on to the next item. The practice has been for the ALAC to approve the candidates who are sent on the Academy Leadership Program. This year, we're in an interesting situation in that we essentially have no option. ALAC has not been given any options. Each of the regions, with two exceptions, have only had one candidate. One of the regions does not have any that are in a position for one reason or another to be put into the leadership program. There are certain qualifications. You have to either be a leader, someone incoming immediate, or have lots of past experience in a leadership position and not having gone to the program before. There are a number of other ifs, buts, and ands.

Of the people who applied for the program, we ended up with essentially five people who have applied and are able to go and have the time to go. Therefore, we are putting forward their names. For the record, we're talking about North America, John Laprise; Europe, Bastiaan Goslings; Africa, [inaudible]; APRALO, [inaudible]; and LACRALO has no one, but AFRALO had a second candidate, Mohamed El Bashir, who applied and he is getting that slot. I was going to ask for a proforma approval from the ALAC. I do not believe we have quorum at this point. We only have six ALAC members and two regions not represented.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: One minute remaining.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we only have one minute remaining apparently. It's usually Olivier's phone that does that.

So I will put this to a consensus call online, but the fact is we don't have a lot of options on it so I'm assuming it will be approved. We'll go on to the next item on the agenda. Oh, does anyone have any comments before we proceed? Or questions? Seeing none.

I see one tick mark, and we'll go on to the next item of the At-Large Review, next steps. And this is a very short item, but we do have some news this time. You may recall that the Organizational Effectiveness Committee looked at the feasibility study that we had spent an infinite amount of time creating and decided that they were in a rather awkward position. They could not recommend to the board that we go ahead and implement recommendations, because in fact, we had not fully accepted any of the recommendations. We had rejected eight of the 16. We had accepted eight with qualification and modification. And that did not give them an easy way to move forward.

They asked MSSI to create a mapping of the issues identified by the review team and what we proposed to do and identify any gaps in those in that comparison. They finally delivered the document just before Christmas, and Holly, I and Cheryl have been looking at it. It was not what we were expecting for a number of reasons that I won't go into

---

detail right now, and we are trying to propose a way to move forward so this review does not last forever essentially in a limbo state. And I think we have a proposal that will be going out to the working party in the next few days, and we'll be able to talk more about it once that happens.

So I don't have a lot more to say other than we hope it will be going forward. If the Organizational Effectiveness Committee accepts what we're proposing – well, if the working party accepts it first and then if the OEC accepts it, we have a way to move forward. If not, I don't know what we're going to do next. Cheryl or Holly, want to say anything?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think retirement is probably the only thing to do next if [inaudible], Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I did say informally, not in any public document, that if we don't find an easy way to move forward, then I will simply stall until I'm no longer chair and it's not my problem.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Coward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Definitely. I may be a coward, but I'm definitely not a masochist.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: There's only so much self-abuse I will subject myself to.

HOLLY RAICHE: [Well, that's a bit late for Cheryl and myself. Great.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. If there are no other comments, we'll go on to the next item, and that is review of the proposed At-Large Fiscal Year 19 – how did we get this late – additional budget request, and I'll turn it over to Heidi to do a brief review.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. It is late. Yes, thank you. Hi to everyone. I wanted to go ahead and just do a little bit of update on where we are with the fiscal year 19 additional budget request. Last week, there was a call of the Finance and Budget Subcommittee and they made some decisions, but first, I want to also just back up a little bit and talk about what kind of requests we're seeing. There are some broad categories. The first one was for the IGF. We actually received six from the RALOs. LACRALO submitted two for the IGF, and the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement submitted one.

What the FBSC decided was that all of them needed a little bit more clarity in terms of the content of the possible workshops, the possible

---

people who would be invited to them, and also to perhaps consider a reduction of the number of slots for each one of those. Some – AFRALO and EURALO asked for five, and again, LACRALO submitted two for a total of five as well. So given the current fiscal outlook, that is likely to not get quite so many approved slots for that. That's the first one.

The second broad outline was for communication and promotional activities. There was a request from AFRALO for a video in various African languages for raising awareness. There was a request for APRALO, a second popup banner. One from NARALO for translation of a mail card, etc. What was decided was that a consolidated request for all of those activities in addition to brochures for all the RALOs and At-Large, for lapel pins, for popup banners that made sure that all RALOs had secondary ones that could travel along with people in the region.

The first set of popup banners travel in a ship that travels from one ICANN meeting to another, so we cannot get to those. A video, the AFRALO video as well. So right now, the sum of that was estimated to be approximately \$10,000 to \$15,000. And again, I'm not sure if that amount needs to be stated in there explicitly, but that's one thing, something that the FBSC can consider again on their call on Monday.

The ALS RALO, there was one for assisting EURALO individual members, particularly the ALS of individual members. FBSC requested that that be clarified to read more broadly for individuals, not necessarily for that ALS in particular.

Alan, also, we had the RALO discretionary funding that was now suggested to be double the amount. So from this year's \$10,000, it was

---

requested to go up to \$20,000. There were other requests. [I'll] just take a look here.

The ALAC Leadership strategy session, that's again for the ALT session on Friday. I did confirm that we do not need to submit that one. That is in core and will continue to be in core. The Global Indigenous People's Ambassador Program, again very successful program that's now in its second year, and this request is for a somewhat significant increase in numbers, but it was agreed that that would be submitted as is. And I think that's – for the most part – it, Alan. I know that LACRALO had another one. Just very briefly, one for some mediation training, a video of that. There were some EURALO ones for Internet of Things. These are I think IGF sessions, and there was another EURALO request for a workshop on likely the Friday before, or even during an ICANN meeting, and we'll be taking a look at that. The next FBSC call is, again, scheduled for Monday. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Heidi. Two comments. One is with regard to the communications budget. One of the motivations is, as Heidi said, there were a number of discrete and relatively – not random, but different types of requests from each or several of the RALOs. The other thing is up until now, there has been a central budget in ICANN from Communications to fund a lot of these kind of things. And the rumor – I'll say – that we're getting is it's not likely to continue this year. So this is partially to replace another budget item which may be disappearing elsewhere in ICANN, and partly to try to give us an easy way of doing these kind of projects. Some of these projects pop up in time to be a

---

budget request, other of them come in six months later. And this gives us the flexibility of reacting quickly if necessary.

And there is one more request that I am thinking of putting in. I just want to give you a heads up since it wasn't mentioned in the Finance and Budget meeting. It's come to our attention in the last – that a number of the ACs and SOs, when there is a change of chair, that they have an offsite meeting with the incoming, the outgoing chair, and the key ICANN staff to try to coordinate the handoff. And since in the past when we have had a chair transition, the old chair has stayed on the ALAC for at least one year, and this time that will not be the case – as I step down, I will also be off the ALAC, and so I'm thinking about putting in a request for whoever becomes the chair that we have an opportunity for a few days to do a handoff and try to minimize any problems that will come about at that point. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I am really uncomfortable with the request of having more details on the RALO workshops for the IGF, more details regarding the topics and regarding the speakers. Suppose we give a proposal now that we don't know yet the overarching theme, because the MAG didn't convene yet. Suppose we give something that will not be covered by this overarching theme. We would have to change it. And if we change it, we have to change all the speakers, because the speakers are for one topic, not for every topic. And last point, will ICANN accept that we propose something and do another thing? I'm not sure. So I am really uncomfortable with that. Thank you.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Alan. Having proposed workshops over years and been to all the IGFs for the past god knows how many years and so on, I feel exactly the same way as Tijani on this in that it's very difficult to define clearly what the workshop topic is about. Now, had ICANN shown some flexibility in the past to say, "Oh, yes, okay, you may make amendments to the workshop," etc., I would have said, "Okay, no worries. We'll have to cross the bridge when we cross it." And I think I mentioned that on the ALT.

That said, I do have concerns that if we do define workshops more clearly and more specifically, so if we focus a workshop and have to make the slightest of changes, we are in the current mood of ICANN wanting to cut on funding things, we are in some kind of a dynamic where anything that can be taken against you will be taken against you. And therefore, we're effectively setting ourselves to fail. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was in the queue, but I'll let Judith go ahead. Please go ahead, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I also support Tijani and Olivier. We try to make – when I did mine, I looked at what was there last year in all the different constituencies,

---

and none of the other constituencies really had the exact proposal or the exact speakers. They had an overview and a generalization of it. And I think we are setting ourselves up to fail. I think we can give general outlines of the topics, but trying to find actual speakers and fill them in is a little bit, I think, too much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I guess my position is somewhat more pragmatic. We have been told at this point that unless we provide some level of detail, they are not going to be funded. Whether that's reasonable or unreasonable, I think we can certainly make the case that it's unreasonable, but I think there's a moderately large chance that the decision has been made.

So I would strongly suggest that we do our best to comply with what they are saying and build into the request the statement that should this exact topic not fit in what the MAG later decides, or should we need to change speakers for whatever reason, that that will be done.

In other words, we're proposing something that we think is reasonable, but know that it might have to change. And I would build that into the proposal, not go back afterwards and say, "Oops, we want to make a change." And I think then we're going to maximize our chances of getting [inaudible] and being able to modify them as necessary.

Olivier is right that, yes, we may be in a mode where they're looking for opportunities to cancel things, but I think we're going to have to presume goodwill at this point and then hold them to it. I don't see any other option, because at this point we're being told, "If you don't have

---

some more level of details, it's going to simply be a no." And we don't want that to happen.

So I would suggest that we couch the proposals so that we will have the flexibility when we need it, and if they accept it under the terms we're asking for, then hopefully we'll be okay. I can't make a guarantee, because we don't know how the world will unfold, but we don't want to submit proposals that we're already being told will not get funded if we don't provide that level of detail. Thank you. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I would like to ask who asked for more details for the workshops. Was it Finance, was it GSE? Who asked for that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi, do you feel comfortable answering, or do you want me to?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, yes. Well, I'm going to say in general. Basically, it's the internal team, staff team that initially reviews the requests. And again, many of them have been to the IGF, they know. Year after year, I hear that from them, that there is a possibility to define and offer more detail on what a general workshop would be, and again who the potential speakers might be. I don't think that things are set in stone, but what they're saying is that these requests need to be clear on when – if they are approved, that the workshop, that is the actual one that people are going to the IGF for, is the one that was mentioned in the request.

---

---

So a concern is that several workshops are being suggested and one gets in, and then things are changed in order to ensure that that is a fit. I think what the concern is is that that workshop may not then be within ICANN's mission, etc. But since that request was approved, there's in a way an obligation to support that workshop, even though again there's a feeling among some people within ICANN that it does not fulfill or it's not [related to] the ICANN mission.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi, I think there's a very big difference between, "It must be within the ICANN mission and clearly within the ICANN mission," and, "It must be locked in right now and cannot be changed." Because until the MAG makes their decisions on what kind of workshops they're going to be funding or they're going to be supporting and approving, we're in a position where something may be straightly within ICANN's mission but not going to get approved.

Now, if it's going to be changed, it's clear it has to stay within ICANN's mission, and we're going to need a process by which we say, "This is how it's changing, and we believe this fits in with the general intent of what we're doing, but now it's supported by the MAG and is clearly within ICANN's mission." If we're worried about going outside of ICANN's mission, then I think we need to say that and make that part clear. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. So Heidi, you said exactly what was my fear. They said that the workshop that you have to implement should be the

---

---

one that you made the request for. So it is exactly the problem. It is more or less made so that our workshop will not be accepted at all. So I think that if this can be changed in this way, any way our request will be approved under conditions, and one of the conditions is MAG approval, then [put] another condition. The condition [would be] the workshop should be in the ICANN mission. But saying, "Today you have to define the workshop with speakers and we don't have to change it when you implement it," that means that you will not be accepted, and that's all.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. We're not going to settle this right now. Clearly, we have been given some guidelines and we will do our best to meet them, but we will also make it clear, I believe, that if things have to change because of the theme of the workshop, the theme of the IGF or other circumstances change, that ICANN is going to be flexible. Now obviously, it has to be within the mission, but I think we have to make sure that we don't have a catch 22 that we have to propose something that may not make sense because it's the only way to get it funded. And that's a stupid waste of resources.

Anyway, there will be a Finance and Budget meeting on Monday. I would strongly suggest that people couch their requests in a way that we believe they will get accepted and still make sure that we have flexibility. That's not a guarantee everything's going to work, but I don't see any other way of moving forward at this point. Any further – final comments?

---

Then we go on to the next agenda item, which is ICANN 61. And at this point, we are about 15 minutes late in the meeting. I'm not going to take it all out of ICANN 61 time, but clearly, we are going to have to constrain things at this point. And I'll turn it over to Gisella, I presume.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, thank you. I'll help you catch up on your time, on those 15 minutes. Not a problem. We've put up the final draft version [point two] of the block schedule in the Adobe Connect room, and at this stage, I'm hoping that this will be pretty final with regards to the cross-community sessions, four of which are scheduled at ICANN 61, three on Monday and one on Wednesday. I know that in the agenda, it's a different order, but as the block schedule has come up, I just wanted to let everyone know that this will be published on the ICANN 61 webpage hopefully by the end of today or otherwise tomorrow. Alan, at this stage, is there anything you'd like to add with regards to the cross-community sessions?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think so. I think they're all interesting sessions. I don't see us – certainly name collisions is a major issue. The board has put essentially a challenge to SSAC to look at the issue of name collisions, and they are expecting to be working on this for – according to the past chair – the next year or two. And the presumption is that no new gTLDs – no new rounds or whatever can be opened until this is addressed. So I think it's an issue of relevance not only from a new gTLD perspective but just understanding this is a crucial issue within the DNS, which is our main

---

mandate within ICANN. And I think it's a session that is going to be interesting and informative. And I will not schedule anything against that one.

GDPR compliance, clearly, it's the issue of the day. And the Open Data Initiative I think is something which is quite marvelous that ICANN is talking about making information available in raw form that people can massage and process. And I think this is something that some of us have been wanting to see for a very long time. And although it may not be everyone's interest, we may end up scheduling working sessions or something against it, I think it's going to have some great interest.

And the last one is an intriguing one, a walk in the shoes of a new gTLD registry operator. It's easy for us to make snide or snarky comments sometimes, but I think it might be a rather interesting session. So I don't plan to schedule any overall At-Large sessions against them. There may be working groups that we decide have no interest in a particular topic, but I think they're all of interest. And there are only four of them this time, which is less than we've seen in some past times. Julie, I see your hand is up, and then Olivier.

JULIE HAMMER:

Just briefly, Alan, to add to what you were saying about name collision. What the SSAC is planning to do is present the project proposal in the state that it is at that point, and [inaudible] to seek community input, comments, feedback on that, but also any comment or feedback on other aspects. So, it's being seen not just as a briefing but as a two-way discussion. So, I just wanted to mention that. Thanks.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                      Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        Thank you, Alan. And I was on all those calls for scheduling. One of the things that did come up – and I’ve heard you said you’re not planning to schedule anything, at least no ALAC things, against those sessions. One of the things that did irritate me is when I heard some people on the call asking that there would be exclusivity if you want. In other words, there would be no other sessions possible while these sessions are taking place. And I was wondering whether that also includes our working group sessions, and does that effectively mean that the meeting staff would not allow any other room to be used in the meantime, or anything to be put on our own agenda at that time? I’m not sure what’s your position on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:                      My position on that has been adamant. The only meeting that I’m aware of where we ever strictly did that was the Helsinki meeting. Every time this issue has come up, I have said very strongly that we should pick interesting topics, but if someone is not interested in them and they believe their community is not interested in them, we should not be in a position of telling them they cannot schedule things against it.

There has been one person in the leadership group who said at the last meeting, “Well, if someone else plans to schedule against a nominally nonconflicted meeting, they have to provide a rationale and prove that



---

they aren't interested in it.” And I would like to see someone force us to do that. So as far as I'm concerned, nonconflicted means we think this is going to be really interesting and you shouldn't schedule a high-interest ICANN-wide topic against it. That is, don't offer a public meeting against this one which is going to essentially divide the crowd. But it will not, in my mind – and these are the presumptions I am working on – stop us from scheduling a private meeting amongst ourselves. And I believe that's what Tanzanica said at the last meeting, that nonconflicted means do not schedule another open public meeting against it. Are you happy with that, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Alan. I totally agree with you and I think our way forward is absolutely fine, but I do get irritated that most of these high-interest topics are actually GNSO topics. There's never anything about the ASO or anything that is a GAC topic, or anything that is from any of the other constituencies. I wonder whether there could be an ALAC-centric topic on capacity building or something.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't you suggest one? These suggestions come from the community.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, the way that it works is that every time there's a sort of voting after that to support and nonsupport, and well, you know how they count the votes and so on. It's been a little bizarre sometimes.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you will note that the last time they asked that everyone submit everyone submit one vote per AC/SO. Unfortunately, of the seven AC/SOs, there only were two votes submitted prior to the meeting, and therefore they held a straw poll at the meeting which suddenly included a large number of GNSO people and a very small number of people from other groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: That has not gone unnoticed and unprotested. I'm not going to say any more.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. So this will pretty much be the block schedule that we'll be dealing with. We are in the process of putting together the At-Large schedule which will be shared as soon as we have confirmed this and finished working on it. The meeting forms are due in by the end of this week, so we will definitely have something to show as of next week. We had a meeting today in Los Angeles. We have a policy workshop here where the Policy team are meeting, and we met with the Meetings team today and we got a little additional information for Puerto Rico. All is looking very good, all the hotels are up and running, and the conference center is similar to the one in Dublin. The [old town] still has a few issues with electricity, but otherwise, Puerto Rico is definitely

---

ready for us to have our meeting there in March, and I think they'll be welcoming ICANN's participation there. Just to run through the travelers, Alan, would you like to update everyone on the additional travelers?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if everyone has been notified yet, the ones who applied that have not been accepted. I asked the staff to do that, but I don't know if it has been done or not.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Yes, my mistake, Alan. Yes, I'm in the process of doing that while the call is going on to notify the people who have been accepted. So they will be getting their e-mails over the next hour or so.

ALAN GREENBERG: The question is, have we notified the people who were not accepted? We can't make the announcements of who was accepted without having the courtesy of telling those who haven't been accepted ahead of time.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, yes, confirming that those who are not accepted have been notified.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: In that case, I believe we can make that announcement today. I don't have the list in front of me. Do you? Hold on.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, I do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me see if I can do it.

GISELLA GRUBER: [It's on your side.]

ALAN GREENBERG: So you're saying you're in the process of notifying, so some people may be notified by hearing it at this meeting. But please go ahead. Some of these people have been funded for the whole travel, some only for the travel part and not hotel and per diem. And please go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. So the name of those, we've got three people who will be fully funded. And as I said, the e-mails are in progress, but we've got Narine Khachatryan, Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, and Daniel Nanghaka. Then we have two slots for travel only which are Javier and Eduardo's slots as they don't need to travel to Puerto Rico because they live there. We have Vanda Scartezini and Jonathan Zuck who will be allocated [the travel openings.] So thank you very much. We've finally come to that decision, and that has been transferred to Constituency Travel. With

---

regards to the main themes and topics to be discussed, Alan, would you like to take that one?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, because I haven't done that preparation at all. So unless Heidi already has a list that she can reference, I don't have anything in front of me.

GISELLA GRUBER: [I'm hearing nothing –]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, are you on the topic of themes?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what we're [on] the topic of.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. Obviously, there are some that are – I would think in general. The fiscal year 19 budget, I would think that you would want to do the At-Large Review, start thinking about At-Large improvements, perhaps ATLAS III. Those are all ones that –

ALAN GREENBERG: Those are – yes, go ahead, Heidi.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I was just going to say obviously, things like if we're at a stage where we are doing something about At-Large improvements, we will be talking about it at the meeting. Unless someone has told us in the interim that there isn't going to be an ATLAS, we obviously are going to be talking about that at the meeting. So yes, there are some obvious ones that will be there simply because their time has come. We haven't gotten to the point of starting to schedule meetings yet, so I'm not quite sure why that item was put on today's agenda. I was on vacation today and just got back a few hours ago, so my apologies for that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: The only reason that that was put on is that today is 45 days to the meeting. And as this Friday is the deadline for meeting forms, so at that point, it all turns to talking about how we're going to fill the meetings that we've submitted meeting forms for. So I think it's just a way to get everyone starting to think about that.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. So let's take that not as Alan discussing it. If anyone believes that there's something we need to be discussing in San Juan during part of our At-Large leadership – the ALAC and regional leadership meetings, please let it be known, let Heidi and me know as soon as possible. This is the time to say it, not after the meeting to complain that we didn't talk about it. And let's go on to item number D, social activities and logistics.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you very much, Alan. So as you can see on the block schedule, we have four evenings for community networking. These slots will be used up by the various groups for community networking, cocktails, etc. We will be using up one of the slots for the NARALO showcase. Let's remember that we have the tenth anniversary of NARALO this year that we will be celebrating in Puerto Rico. We also had [jams] on one of the evenings. I'm not sure whether the evening has been confirmed. And we have a gala evening on Monday. We have no details on the gala evening yet, but I do believe that we will be holding one in Puerto Rico. And that's as far as the social events go at this stage, and nothing more to add from me for this meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And the standard caveat, if people are having trouble with travel issues, please make sure you let Heidi or I or both of us know that you're having either an issue associated with visas or an issue with Constituency Travel, or whatever the issue is. Don't let it go on for months before you let someone know. Judith, please go ahead.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Also, some of us who are coming for the North American School of Internet Governance and may be staying on for later, if we could get ourselves included on the travel page, that would be helpful as well so people can coordinate.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, in general, people who are going along with us, even if they're funded by an unusual means, we normally include it in the travel page. So yes, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. That's why I wanted to check on that, because [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: I certainly have no problem with that. If there's some reason we should not be doing it or can't be doing it, someone should let me know privately. Anything else on ICANN 61? Judith, your hand is still up, but I assume that's an old hand. Next item then is – you will recall that in Abu Dhabi we made a decision [that what previously have been] groups such as the New gTLD Working Group, the Registration Issues Working Group and such are going to be effectively downgraded into primarily a mailing list. And the group that has been called the ICANN Evolution Group, previously IANA Transition and Accountability Working Group, is going to have its mandate enlarged to cover essentially all ICANN policy issues.

So if we're going to hold working sessions, rather teleconferences, webinars, which is basically what that group did, when there is a need



---

to discuss some topic – and whether that was the IANA transition model or accountability or other things along the way – that is the group under whose auspices these meetings are scheduled, and we will be using an invitation list which is the sum total of all of the policy discussion groups that we have. Jonathan Zuck has volunteered to co-chair along with Olivier that overall working group, and Jonathan will also be overseeing one of the mailing lists on new gTLD issues. Which he has just a little bit of knowledge about since he's chaired the CCT Review Team. Just a little bit, right, Jonathan? You don't have to unmute.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's only been going on for 75 years. Another 25 years, we'll really have a handle on [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

On top of that, Jonathan is a rather interesting person, so start talking to him about some other random subject [at the next meeting you see him.] He has an interesting background. In any case, we have a little minor topic. We need to decide what this working group is going to be called. As I said, it's gone through three evolutions of names so far, and we could simply call it the At-Large Policy Working Group, or we can call it the At-Large Integrated Policy Working Group or Unified Policy Working Group.

Does anyone have any thoughts on what the name should be? It should have of course a good acronym if we can come up with one. It turns out we do have to make a decision soon, because we have to set up the mailing list structure. But other than that, does anyone have any strong

---

feelings, or would you like to delegate it to one or two people to come up with a name? And Cheryl says, “Yes, the acronym is the key point indeed.” “Monster of Policy, MOG?” I don’t think so, Jonathan.

Alright, we are not going to decide it on this call. We’re running a little bit late in time in any case. We will come up with a name, and we’ll do our best to try and make sure it’s not too boring. Heidi or anyone, do we need to do anything else on this formally at this point? Although I know you really want a name.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

On this call? Well, I think it would be useful to move that forward until we have a time for the next call. Would you like to have staff send a doodle out for the next call [of this merged group?]

ALAN GREENBERG:

As soon as we come up with a name, we’ll schedule a call.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

For those of you who have certain heritage, by the way, you should check what a moggie is. It may not be what we want to call this group, because getting these meetings together will be herding moggies. Some of you may have to look up the definition.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Oh, god.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Are we in Any Other Business?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are. No one had Any Other Business to introduce.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. So I just wanted to remind everyone that we're starting –

ALAN GREENBERG: But if you'd like – okay, let me officially – does anyone have Any Other Business?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, please go ahead.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [We're] starting the captioning program which is now being called real-time transcription. We're starting in February, so please send in your requests of what calls you would like to be captioned or transcribed to staff and to me, and we'll put it on a list. We're creating a list, and we can do six calls a month. But sorry, only English. We were not allowed to have Spanish or French this time. So just let us know, and we look forward to hearing from you and seeing your list.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other Any Other Business? In that case, the main part of the meeting is over. We will now go into an in-camera session. This is for ALAC members, regional leaders, and any of the liaisons to other ACs and SOs who choose to stay on at this point. And we will have to have everyone else both leave the bridge and the Adobe Connect. This is a rather unusual meeting. I don't believe the ALAC has ever had one like this, but we have an unusual circumstance that we have to address right now. And there will be no recording and no interpretation, so I thank the interpreters for their work on this meeting, and that part of the meeting is now over.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Alan, just give me one second please while I'm confirming it with Adigo.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

---

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay, the recording has restarted now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Thank you, this is Alan Greenberg, chair of the ALAC – with an echo. The ALAC and regional leaders met in an in-camera confidential session. We discussed a personnel issue. There was no decision, no action taken. And the ALAC meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all for staying on a little bit longer. I appreciate it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye all. Thank you.

---

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**