
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC leadership monthly call on Monday 23rd April at 18:00 UTC. On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Sebastian [inaudible], Seun Ojedeji, Bartlett Morgan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Barrack Otieno, Andrei Kolesnikov, Yrjo Lansipuro, Olivier Crepin-Leblond. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Evin Erdogan, Claudia Ruiz, and myself Gisella Gruber. If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. I have displayed the agenda, and I believe I will be changing the pages as to the agenda as I can't give you scrolling rights, and please do bear with us as Webex is still in trial and therefore finding our way around. Thank you very much Alan and over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, and I welcome you to this meeting. It is a pleasure to have full attendance, and we will get started. Hopefully it will be a quick meeting but that remains to be seen. The first item is review of ALT meeting of the 16th March, which was in Puerto Rico, and I'll turn it over to Heidi, even though it has my name on it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much. Hi everyone, we do have a few action items from that meeting in San Juan. Several of which will be discussed during the question section on ICANN 62 prep, however, there are a few that are not related to that. The first is Cheryl Langdon-Orr to provide

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.

information regarding a now defunct ICANN PDP analyst working group to [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: That is incorrectly worded, that is not the PDP working group. That was the security and stability working group. The cross community group.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If you could please note that, it has been completed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In fact I gave, I think it was Gisella, the details of that, the name of that group there and then. So, if there was a note from me that was pending. No I haven't written to [inaudible], but I did say specifically what the group was, I will get up the link and you want me to send it directly, I will. Fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here. If I could have chatted, which we aren't allowed to chat because whoever is running Webex hasn't given us chat privileges, we can only talk to the panelists. So we can talk to Gisella or Claudia, which is very nice but doesn't help me say, I didn't have that noted as an ll sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why can't you talk to the panelists, does it not give an option of all participants like it used to? [inaudible]. Alright, can we have a note to staff to make sure that we have chat in our future meetings. Usually there are many options and one of them is, all participants and one is all attendees. I think the difference is attendees is not the hosts and the participants are include the hosts, or vice versa. I've never been able to figure out which. But in any case, neither of those options are there today.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, please, Gisella here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: I am just checking again, I can send to all participants and I know that we've had this issue in the past which has taken nearly all the call to get... to sort this out so we are working on it, but if people could just confirm whether they can send to all participants or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is not one of the options that I have. I have host, presenter, host and presenter, all panelists, Gisella, and Claudia. Now maybe in this meeting we'll all panelists and everyone is all panelists, I don't know. If there's a help on this thing, I haven't found it yet. In any case, let's not waste time, I said for the next meeting can we have chat if not possible for this one. If you can confirm all of us are panelists here... let me send to all panelists and see if anyone gets it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've been sending to all panelists and they haven't been responding. Maybe they might to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK, well. You are a panelist now. I've just got a message saying you are the panelist now. Now we're all panelists, so now maybe all panelists would work. Let's not waste time on the chat right now, it will be nice to have but it's not the only criteria. Ah, I see now only Barrack is an attendee, the rest of us are panelists. Now Barrack is a panelist. Isn't it nice we're all panelists, don't you feel warm and cozy. First item on the agenda.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can hear you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I haven't finished with the action items.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am sorry, please go ahead then.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Next one is Alan Greenberg to provide a report on closed ALT meeting on ICANN 61. I don't recall that having been done.

ALAN GREENBERG: No it isn't but it is on the agenda today.

HEIDI ULLRICH: OK. I did not place it there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know you didn't.

HEIDI ULLRICH: The next one, staff to note that ALT meetings will be closed at future ICANN meetings. That may be coming up during the session on ICANN 62. Another one then is Alan Greenberg to work with staff at ALAC to update metrics on meeting attendance, last updated in 2016.

ALAN GREENBERG: Was that done?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, take yourself off mute, if you are on mute please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry Heidi, I am just looking and trying to sort out the attendees, I am doing the call management. Just bear with me a second while I read through the AI.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, whether it has been done or not right now, it doesn't really matter. It really needs to be done if it wasn't, however.

HEIDI ULLRICH: All the other ones are related to ICANN 62, which I have noted and Gisella is aware of during our session today on ICANN 62. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't actually see the ALT report on the agenda, I was sure I typed it in, but it is not there. I did have some problems with

conference last night, it kept on doing funny things to do, but I've now put her under AOB. Alright, the next item is policy issues and if we can go to Evin. I don't know what the status is, as of last night this did not seem to have been updated. I haven't looked at it today. I trust this page was updated, however.

EVIN ERDOGU: Hi Alan, thank you. This is Evin. Yes, the agenda was updated and also I think everyone can see it, or it was on the screen a moment ago. I'll just share the link to the agenda in the chat, just incase.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for future reference, this really should be updated more than a few days before, not at the last few hours.

EVIN ERDOGU: Sure [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We actually did have some activity this weekend on a few policy statements, so there were some other things coming in.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand it may change in the details right at the end, but the overall update should be done earlier if we can. Anyway, let's go ahead with where it is today.

EVIN ERDOGU:

Sure, so I think everyone has seen most of these statements that have been approved by the ALAC. At the top there are some summaries now. Perhaps we can just go ahead and chat about the statement in process, the first one being data protection privacy issues update with the team community input on article 29 guidance. That was submitted by Jonathan Zuck, who tried to collate some comments on behalf of ALAC, but I think over the weekend there was some disagreement as to whether this represented the ALACs opinion. So it was suggested that perhaps this could be withdrawn and then maybe separate comments could be submitted.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. The issue is, there was a... the Wiki page was put up very late. The actual discussion on the mailing list took place on a thread which had a different subject line. The subject line of the thread that was discussing this issues was the accreditation model, so Evin reasonably had some difficulty in collecting all of the comments, since some of them were missed. Moreover, Holly who is one of the stronger opinions on the subject, was busy on other things and didn't get a chance to write her comment or critique Jonathan's comment until essentially it was too late. So we had a comment that went in as an ALAC comment which clearly does not fully represent the community, my suggestion would be, and I made on this on mailing list and in the Wiki, but no one actually explicitly answered it. My suggestion at this point is to withdraw that statement and not have a vote on it, as I do not believe that it is representative of the ALAC. It neither represents all the

positions, nor does it recognize that there are varied positions. Unless there is any objection, that is what I suggest we do on that statement. I'll leave the floor for a moment. I don't hear any voices or see any hands, so I think that is what I'll do, and if you Evin can speak to whoever is responsible for that comment and have it withdrawn, if that is possible.

EVIN ERDOGU: Sure, I'll do so right away.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, and if we can go onto the next one please.

EVIN ERDOGU: Sure. The next one, this week, this Wednesday is ICANN reserve fund proposed replenishment strategy. Our comments are due this Wednesday 25th April.

ALAN GREENBERG: Where are we on that? Do we have any comments at all posted? I know we don't have a draft statement.

EVIN ERDOGU: Yeah, we don't have a draft statement, we do have some comments. We could perhaps post the first draft and collect comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: It would seem like I am the pen holder, I don't recall that volunteering, but I am willing to take that on and I'll try to do something on that today.

EVIN ERDOGU: Thanks. The last set I have here is not a formal public comment, but Holly requested a Wiki space be created since this is an important issue. The IPCBC accreditation and access model for non public data.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is fine. If it has... I think it was done already, was it not?

EVIN ERDOGU: Let me see. I think she sent something over email and I remind I haven't submitted anything.

ALAN GREENBERG: No not submitted. Was the Wiki page created?

EVIN ERDOGU: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is yes. I see it is. OK. That's another issue where there are divided opinions, there seems to be a rather strong opinion with some people, focused on the NCSG but held by at least Holly and perhaps others in at-large, since this is a statement that was created... not a

statement, a document that was originated with the IPC and the business constituency, that it's not a legitimate process and I have some difficulty with that, I must admit. An accreditation model, something ICANN should be working on for the last 6 months, if not longer. The fact that somebody has gotten off their somethings and actually put something to paper, I think is admirable. I may be unique in that sense, but it's clearly one of the issues and it's one of the policy issues I'm going to talk about in a minute. Anything else Evin?

EVIN ERDOGU:

No, that's all. There are several, actually 4, comments that are open currently. 3 due in May and 1 due in June that ALAC has not yet decided if it would like to comment upon.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let's look at them one by one. The first one is revisions to the bylaws. I assume that's the bylaws regarding the GNSO. That's the only voting thresholds that I am aware of. That is adding voting thresholds to support the empowered community actions, if I remember correctly. Cheryl correct me if I'm wrong, and I see no reason for getting involved in that at all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You are correct Alan, that is absolutely true. We could do a, yes we agree, but it's just one of those bizarre ones we can ignore.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would not want them commenting on how we do our voting on the empowered community, so I'm not sure I even want to comment on it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Like I said, we can ignore it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Next, draft final report on NomCom review.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We definitely need to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: It closes in a few days. How do we instigate any interest in this? I welcome input from anyone in this call. Cheryl is one of the co-chairs of the working party, she cannot write our comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For those of you who haven't read it, which I'm not going to do a Q and A, but I'm sure I've seen any of you at any presentations I've been running at all the meetings lately. It's not a long document, even looking at the executive summary, I think you'll find that from my point of view, we could at least [inaudible] well met, but you do actually have NomCom members who are previous serving NomCom people... sorry NomCom review members who are previously serving NomCom people, that you could use. You have currently serving NomCom members who are on that committee, so, if you wanted to take it outside of the ALT

and I should apologize for my voice Alan, sorry. If you want to take it outside of the ALT and the ALAC, you can. I think in the time available, if Maureen or somebody wants to do a quick... Bartlett or somebody wants to do a quick scan of the executive summary, I am happy to answer any questions, but obviously I am pleased with it or we wouldn't have published it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, I will send a note to recent NomCom people, at least a subset of recent NomCom people who I think might have some input into it and try to get them at least to comment on the Wiki. Evin.

EVIN ERDOGU: Sure, the next one is CCWG accountability...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Wait wait wait. Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Olivier please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, sorry. It is Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. There is Yrjo in the queue with his hand up, I don't know if you can see him, and me as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: He's scrolled off my list. Yrjo please go ahead. [inaudible] I'm not used to it yet.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Hi, this is Yrjo Lansipuro. I hope you can hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Actually, Olivier has collected some ideas for this statement within EURALO, from [inaudible] and from me, so perhaps Olivier could comment on how these will be conveyed to the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can answer that, if they are not put on the Wiki, they are not going to go into any statement.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan, it's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was just going to say, we had a little internal discussion on this where I contacted our previous NomCom people. I think that you sent an email also to a few people who were NomCom as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. That was on something else.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: OK. Well... I thought that maybe they would liaise back to you. What I will do, and it was a thing that was a bit off the record and so on, but I will ask if I can do a cut and paste and put it on the Wiki. We got some interesting feedback from our different ex and current members of the NomCom. I have different views by the way and I got told off.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here. Can I ask Olivier, was this a generic bitching over NomCom and what should be done, or is it directly reacting to the recommendations made by the external examiner. Because, what this is about is a response to the external examiners report, not a continued [inaudible] about what we would like to have happen.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Cheryl, it's Olivier speaking. It's actually in response to what is written in the report. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: If anyone in the community believes that what the recommendations are saying is incorrect, there's nothing to stop them making a personal comment and attributing it to themselves. I'd like to think people will do that. If we may go on to the next one.

EVIN ERDOGU: Sure. The next one, that is to be determined, is CCWG accountability work stream 2 final report.

ALAN GREENBERG: That may be viewed as ho-hum by many people, all of the issues have been reviewed innumerable times and to the extent, Cheryl perhaps, you can give me a very quick summary. Is there anything in this that is really counter to what we have either seen or suggested be there in the past?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan, Cheryl for the record again. There is not although I am not particularly sure that anyone who hasn't been closely related to the process, in other words your articulated members in the CCWG accountability, as well as, regular participants in all of the work streams will have watched all the dotting of the I's and crossing of the T's. There are only a few of us within the at-large community that have been regular attendees at all of the component parts of the CCWG. So, it's one if you've got the time to do it. That I would encourage us to put a affirmative and supportive statement on the Wiki and ask at least go through the process of seeing if we get a reaction. There are too many very important changes, that should come to part as a result of this, I mean beyond jurisdiction that it would nice to know Tijani, and [inaudible] are not the only ones, other than myself that really are across all of the details of all of the pieces. But, having watched it all, everything is where we expected it to be, but if you were to ask, anybody on this call about a specific intricacy of any specific one of

those recommendations, I'm not terribly sure we'd get 100% responses.
Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll be honest. This is also an opportunity to voice concerns, if not opposition to anything that you believe indeed is going in the wrong direction, and I for one may well put in a comment on the staff accountability parts that I think in light of things that have unrolled in the last few months, that we maybe signing ourselves up for overly bureaucratic processes and very expensive processes that I'm not sure end up significantly helping the situation. I haven't decided to write that, but I may. I think ICANN is becoming overwhelmed with process and procedures, and bureaucracy and I suspect this might augment that, not help the situation. That is just a personal opinion, something I plan to be looking at in a little bit of depth. Any further comments on CCWG? Last is the initial report on the computer standing committee, the CSC charter. I don't know to what extent anyone feels they want to participate in that. I don't have very strong feeling about it. Anyone have any comments about that one? Olivier, is that a new hand? No, it is not a new hand. OK. Anyone have any further comments on this? We are a little bit behind time at this point, I will be talking more about policy issues in one of the agenda item, so I think we'll, at this point go onto the next agenda item. That is, does any of our liaisons have any verbal reports that they would like to give, in addition to the written reports which we expect of all liaisons? This is to highlight things that are going on in your particular area, or things that you believe the ALAC should be aware of, or perhaps react to?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, sorry. I'm not even seeing... I think it might be... there it is. I don't have anything specifically from the GNSO which we meet later this week, but I do have something that I just want to put a placeholder when we get to ICANN 62, if you can come back to me please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will try to remember to do that. Anything further from liaisons? Seeing nothing, we are now back on schedule. Thank you. At-large review next steps, you all are aware the proposals for the implementation, the overview of the implementation has been sent to the OEC, I am told there are meetings going on virtually as we speak and we can expect to hear a response from the OEC, or at least hear what the response is in their workshop in May, and assuming that response is positive, the next step is to go to the board hopefully at the June meeting in Panama, is conceivable the OEC may come back to us and ask for some quick action on something, and hopefully that will not delay going to the board, on the other hand it could. So, nothing else to report at this point. It is in process, it is out of our hands, and we are optimistic that something will happen soon. Any questions or comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hand Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I've been putting hand up in the chat because it is hard to scroll up and down if you're running a call. I hope, Alan, that was helpful, but I can stop and jump in if needs be. Just not so much on where we are in that process, but where we need to be in the preparation for the next phase in our review process. I responded to the staff reach out to leads on working groups, and asked them not to send the proforma refresh or resign message that you had penned, Alan, for that review working party work group. Because, of unique aspects of the review working party as it needs to go over to the implementation phase. Did you want me to work directly with you on a specific wording for that? Or, what do you want to do as next steps?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't believe I instructed that one be refreshed, if I did, it was a misunderstanding. As far as I'm concerned the working party as such, it will be dissolved once we find out that the OEC and the board is taking action and we will create an implementation group that may bear some resemblance to the working party and may not. [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to pen something in preparation to sort of get that kick started then. I was not happy for them to send out the proforma one, it needed be different [inaudible] still a regionally balanced one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me say it again, so it is clear and there is no misunderstandings. As far as I'm concerned, the at-large working party, which oversaw the review, will be disbanded at this point and we will create a new for purpose group to start working on the implementation. There is no question of it renewing the membership in this group, as far as I am concerned. Any further comments, questions, on the at-large review? We have now exceeded the one minute. I see no hands, I hear no voice, we will go onto the next item which is at-large at ICANN 62, and I will turn it over to, I believe it's Gisella, unless it's Heidi.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry Alan, Gisella again. I was on mute. Just to say, let me bring it back... so ICANN 62. What I've put up on the screen is the block schedule that is currently have. I'm not sure if you're able to scroll through it, I don't think you are. We have the four days running from Monday 25th June through to Thursday 28th June. We're running late on the scheduling of the main ICANN 62 block schedule, due to the cross community topics not yet been selected. The vote ran through until today, for the various groups to vote on which cross community topics are going to be selected, and also what will come out of that is the duration of each cross community session. As it stands now, the last 2 blocks of the day are put aside for the cross community sessions,

running from 15:15 through to 18:30. Again, it is going to be one topic or a longer session covering both slots, yet to be determined, hence a slight delay in putting the whole schedule together. Also, as it's a policy forum I have approached the GNSO support staff to know what their draft schedule is looking like as PDPs will impact the attendance of some of the ALAC members on our side and at this stage they're not able to share anything with us until we've had a view on the cross community sessions, when they're going to be scheduled. That's going to impact their schedule. We have asked [inaudible] if we're going to be getting anything today, and I think it's going to be highly unlikely. I'm hoping to get something through tomorrow that also won't be in time for the ALAC call, which we have at 04:00 UTC tomorrow morning, for the people in the US it will be later on in your day today. That's running through the block schedule. Again the evening sessions on day one, we don't know yet if it's going to be a local host reception, and the other days from 6:30 to 7:30 we have community networking time. What I'd like to run through with you is the decision that we're taken during the ALT meeting in Puerto Rico, which affects the scheduling of our meetings. So, if you just bear with me while I try and upload this onto your screen. Hopefully it'll work.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Gisella, just to be correct. The ALT does not make decisions, the ALT is suggesting this.

GISELLA GRUBER:

My apologies, I will reword it. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't need this discussion reopened.

GISELLA GRUBER: OK. I'm going to change that as we speak. It's the ALT suggestions, please read suggestions in Puerto Rico on the ICANN 62 policy forum. As we discussed on the Friday and just to make sure that we all agree on this, which will help us move forward swiftly once we have the cross community sessions. Mid April, at-large meeting schedule, as I've just explained we're running late on the cross community sessions, and also we were supposed to have our first ICANN 62 planning call, not from at-large side but from an ICANN side, early April and that was delayed until the 19th April. Again a 2 week delay there, but we will be hopefully have something by the end of next week. Again, all subject to receiving the cross community topics. The end of April, hopefully an agenda in draft, again maybe if we just allow a week or two and maybe move that onto mid May to have an agenda in draft action item for Heidi, Alan, and myself. What was suggested was, that we would not have any working group meetings. With regards to the RALOs only LACRALO meetings. With regards to the outreach, I know that Olivier already has the ball rolling for a joint outreach event and I will hand it over to him to give a little bit more detail on that one, just after this slide. On the schedule we will have the at-large meetings in the mornings and the first afternoon slot, and then the cross community sessions in the afternoons. The standing at-large prep and review will also be scheduled for 90 minutes for the four days. With regards to the topics that were suggested, we've got the at-large review, new gTLDs, trends,

strategic planning with Theresa Swinehart, and then to be confirmed, the ccNSO and SSAC. Do we have any comments at this stage? No comments?

ALAN GREENBERG: I see no hands at this point.

GISELLA GRUBER: Wonderful. Just before I would like to hand it over to Olivier for the outreach session, but just before I do. The ALT meeting on Friday 29th June from 8 to 12 time to be confirmed the exact timings but it's the date that's been pencilled in. Also, just to decide whether we try and have an ALT breakfast on the Monday morning as the schedule is starting with... let me just get back to Monday... with the welcome and multistakeholder ethos awards at 8:30. So, we could have a breakfast that morning.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we should plan on it, at this point.

GISELLA GRUBER: Perfect. With regards to social events, we've got the local host event to be confirmed on the Monday. Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, as pointed out from 6:30 to 7:30 we've got networking events, I've just to, as I say that, I've just got to check that on the Thursday that is the case and it's not replaced with the cocktail. It's not playing ball with me. To

be confirmed, whether we're having an ALAC dinner. Whether gems are performing, and also there was discussion from Alberto Soto on a BBQ.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any comments on anything before I go onto one item I would like to talk about. [inaudible]. Let me do mine first and then we'll go to you. As Gisella noted, there will be an ALT meeting on Friday morning until noon hour. I would like positive confirmation either from Gisella who already knows it, or from individuals that everyone is going to be attending and whether you have made appropriate flight arrangements yet. The rules that we are working by, in theory, are that if you can find reasonable flights out on Friday you should. If you cannot find reasonable flights on Friday, that you can stay over until Saturday. We have had some problems with constituency travel on this, and if anyone is having difficulty in making the proper arrangements, please contact me, Gisella, and Heidi immediately. If we don't hear from you, we're assuming everything is working well. Now over to you Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Alan. I just wanted to raise the awareness... let me start this sentence again. I'm speaking through razor blades. It's difficult. [inaudible] here that Gisella is interacting with GNSO staff, because the GNSO plans are radically different in terms of scheduling for this meeting, than they have been for any other meeting. So, I think it's important that we keep a close eye on that. That said, I've got a meeting... Jeff and I have a meeting with leadership of GNSO along with all the other PDP leaders and GNSO staff shortly, in a couple of hours to

do more planning on the PDP part of all of our work. What I needed to let you know Alan, is that at this stage we will be having at least 2 sessions on geographic names, which should be in the unconflicted block sections, which is good and will make life easier. But, the GNSO is planning a fifth stage, and there this huge pushback, on dedicating whole days, other words right through until 3 o'clock in the afternoon, on a specific PDP. So it would be sub pro for a whole day 9 till 3. Subsequent procedures for new gTLDs will be a full day of meeting and that is going to affect our scheduling so, you and staff need to be really on top of that. I will let you know as soon as we know more, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I trust someone, somebody is speaking up in the GNSO meeting, saying although we appreciate the difficulties of the GNSO getting their work done, when they do this, they are virtually guaranteeing that the concept of anyone can participate in a GNSO PDP is being made a sham. I don't have the answer to the problem, but I hope they are at least aware of it. That there are people other than the GNSO. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I see Alan, I hear what you're saying. That question has been raised, the response for this meeting from the leadership of the GNSO, so this is the leadership team, the chair and two vice-chairs is, this meeting is a policy meeting and by running a predictable day on a specific topic, should allow, or if the topic is small, half-day, should allow other people to plan more easily to be there. I'll tell you more when I know more. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Further comments on ICANN 62?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, it's Gisella, I do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead. I do see we have Olivier's hand up, so maybe we'd like to go to Olivier first.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes Olivier, I would like to reach out to him for the outreach event.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'm not quite sure really where we're going at the moment with regards to outreach, because of course, this whole meeting has been called the policy meeting, but we knew that originally it's the outreach and policy meeting. This is why we're actually doing it in a smaller place, in smaller venue so as to be able to be the non usual suspect places. We were looking at having a joint outreach session, not just with the NCUC but this time around with the NCSG, NCUC, and [inaudible]. Which I understand is sort of the widest non commercial part of the GNSO, in fact it is all of the non commercials in the GNSO. The discussions have suddenly brought us at the moment to the idea that perhaps 120 minutes, so 2 full hours would be good. With a little break in the middle

or something, because we definitely ran out of time after 90 minutes in San Juan. So, we looked at maybe 2 hours or needing 2 and a half hours. The problem of course, is how do you fit this with the current block schedule. Certainly, bearing in mind that the GNSO is going to have full days as well, I think we definitely need some coordination between staff in the GNSO and at-large staff to see where we can do something that is unconflicted. I don't mind starting at 8, but it will probably have to go until 10. The first block one would be used on one of the days. That's all I have to say for the time being. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, we'll look into this to see, to work with GNSO staff. As Cheryl said, they do have a call later today to discuss this because it's going to be quite difficult to find a 90-120 minute slot, non conflicting, so I've made not of it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anything further on ICANN 62? Seeing no hands.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking if I may.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, is that a new hand or an old hand?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It is a new one that I didn't put down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, that was one of the questions. The other thing is the cross community working group on internet governance face-to-face meeting. Again, it's one of the charting organizations I had to ask for a location, so I should ask Gisella then to try and see where we can fit that one. I think traditionally we've ended up doing it during lunchtime. Is the rule on this occasion, that the lunch is not to be used at all? I note that the block schedule always looks very nice and clean, then afterwards it's all over the place.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, Olivier. I submitted a request for a high interest session, one of the afternoon sessions, on behalf of the RDS WHOIS review team, and I got no push back whatsoever, that it had to be done by an ACSO, but it's a bit late to do that right now, if you are looking for an afternoon session.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can certainly check with [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, it is too late now, because the request is no longer open. If someone can address Olivier's question about lunch hour sessions?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes Alan, this is Gisella. I would be happy to do so. The lunch session can be booked from 12:15 to 1:15 to allow for a 15 minute transition on either side.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I will follow up with Nigel and you, Gisella, on this thing. It sounds like another one of those struggles yet again.

GISELLA GRUBER: This is Gisella. Yes please Olivier, if you can please copy me in. I remember last time [inaudible] at the end had to try and help find the slot, but if we can all just be copied in and maybe if you wish to copy Heidi in as well. It's just for the scheduling of this and submitting the forms etc.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I just wish I was told about these things, it's just getting irritating with time. We always have to end up... it sounds like at the end we're getting a favor to actually get a slot at an ICANN meeting. When this is a cross community working group, it's chartered by [inaudible] since the GNSO has dropped off, to organizations, to you know... I really don't know what is going on here. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's the way a lot of us feel about a lot of this Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I sense that. It's not going to cut my appetite though, you know, I'm still looking forward to some nice evening dinner, but yeah, whatever.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments on ICANN 62 before we go onto the next item.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I've heard back, so just we can pencil stuff in, I'm trying to be helpful, so we can pencil something in. At this stage, it looks like at least the new gTLD, the PDP subsequent procedures for new gTLD, will be on day one, the Monday. It's pencilled in, again, subject to change in our meeting later today, but at this stage it would be the three 90 minute blocks. 9:00 to 10:15, 10:30 to 12:00, and 13:30 to 15:00 all for sub pro activities on day one, Monday. Now, if that helps, hopefully it will.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. That is Tuesday on the schedule but it looks an awful lot like Monday, but it's Tuesday on the screen right now, but Tuesday and Monday look all the same. [inaudible] ICANN 62. Going one...

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Just to confirm that as ALT has made suggestions that no working groups are meeting, is this going to be announced on the ALAC call later today for some, tomorrow for other? Just to make sure that we don't have any working group coming up and saying, we want to meet, we've got things to discuss.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are certainly going to present that on the call later today, early tomorrow for some of you. You will present it, and I hope the word on the display will be correct by then.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry Gisella again, so I can put ALT suggestions?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes you can. We will have an interesting discussion no doubt.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're welcome. Any other comments? Alright, next item is policy work. This has been an interesting time. The fallout... the follow on to the ICANN meeting in San Juan related to discussion on GDPR, on the KSK rollover, and on something else, I can't remember what at this point. Resulted in very significant comments being made that I think demonstrate that the ALAC can be effective, very effective on policy issues when we actually put our mind to it. How we ended up handling the following discussions on GDPR which were on an even tighter time constraint and the ones on the accreditation model, point out that they can easily fall apart, however, if we are not managing this and focusing on it properly. I think that's both a positive good statement and a bad statement. There's a lot of work coming up, the GDPR is far from over and it's far from clear how it's going to unfold. I think one can almost guarantee that this is going to be an interesting time. ICANN is now in a position where we are not going to be ready for May 25th, by any possible reality. Contracted parties and ICANN are going to have take some action. I think there's a reasonable chance we're going to see some significant blackout on WHOIS going forward. ICANN has asked for a stay or a waiver from the data commissioners to delay implementation with regards to WHOIS, or enforcement rather. My understanding is, that is a request that the data commissioners do not have the authority to grant. We are certainly in an interesting position and as I already mentioned, the accreditation model, I think is crucial.

There is work going on and an accreditation model, which has been firmly criticized by some, if only because of the origins of it, and perhaps because of the contents as well. New subsequent procedures, new gTLD subsequent procedures, we are likely to see a draft report in the June timeframe, that is going to have an awful lot in it, including a very large number of questions and issues for the community to weigh in on. The experience we had with the last major gTLD set of questions, which was an internal to the working group questions they asked was not good. You may remember, we farmed the different sections out to different people, and both Cheryl and I can attest to the awkwardness of the ask in meetings, can you explain why the ALAC said this, when it is something that both of us, number one, could not explain, and in some cases the statement was exactly the opposite to other statement ALAC has made in the past on the same subject. So, we're really going to have to get our act together, because to a large extent, this is our kick at the can to get more involvement in this PDP and have an outcome which is acceptable to us. We have very little reason to complain to the board afterwards, if we don't like the results of the PDP, if we didn't say so along the way. That doesn't mean we win, but if we don't even speak up with a coherent and good statement on each of the subjects. Then we have no basis on which to complain, no solid basis on which to complain and expect the board to take notice of our complaint. Although, we have the right to give advice to the board anytime we want, if we want it to be listened to, we have to make sure we have credibility. Timing is different, we are in a similar position, and we seem to have noise on the line from someone or other, I don't quite know how. I'm not sure I'm asking for any particular input or suggestions at this point. Just to note that from the point of view of the RALOs, and we have someone

representing each RALO on this call, we're going to have to get people involved to respond to these things, but it's not just a matter of finding a living body we have to make sure that we get enough input into each of these processes that we can move forward with comments that we can stand behind afterwards. I think it's going to be really important to get comments on Wiki's for each of these comments and I'm not quite sure how we're going to organize the Wiki to make it more reasonable on how to organize the input. Just having a single comment on the whole report is not going to make it easy to do something with, I think we need to think about, and if anyone has any thoughts on how we can do this, to make it more reasonable then we need to do that. I'm going to open the floor at this point to anyone with any thoughts on either how we have handled these issues in the recent past, or how we're going to handle them going forward. I think these are all very important issues and we can't afford to be silent on them. On the other hand, we have to make sure what we're saying is informed and defensible. I'll open the floor. Anyone have a hand up. I see no hands. We can gain some time by not talking about this further, but I think I'd like an opportunity if anyone has anything to say or thoughts on how to move forward? Last call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. With some of these processes, we may be able to take a different approach to others. Where you have the CCWG activities, you have members who you've allocated one per region. They have the benefit, if you can call it that, for example, travel support to attend meetings etc. I think we could look at a primary pen holder and coordinator assistance role. They cannot pen the documents themselves necessarily, in response. But they can in fact, work with, because we don't just want to have the usual suspects as well, we want to have an open and inclusive system as possible, one that can be by Wiki. It can be done by our friends themselves, or all of the work tracks members having a [inaudible] making it available to other people who are commenting. I am sure there's a way, but I think we can keep our finger on the pulse of the CCWG aspect of the work stream 2, easier than perhaps the new gTLD sub pro. The sub pro is not well enough populated, yes we do have some people there but it really needs to be the some people there, that hold the primary pen holding job and you and I can supervise, for want of a better term, if everything is going totally off the rails. The same thing probably doesn't need to get said for the work track 5 where we do have [inaudible] far more widely spread PDP involvement. I think each of the ones you've got listed, are going to be able to retrieve slightly different. I agree with you, I don't want to be put in the same position again, of basically disagreeing, personally disagreeing, let alone not only not understanding the rationale of what went into as public comment, which happened in the CC1 and CC2 subsequent procedures. I think we can work smarter and maybe we can spend a little bit of time at ICANN 62, finding out a way of doing that. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Regarding the CCWG, I have no problem with a participant in the group, and one of the 5 ALAC people pending the comment, assuming other people are contributing. I do have a problem if that person chaired the operation. That's a little bit more... the optics are a little bit more awkward, but I participated in a lot of them and I wouldn't mind writing the document. But, it's really important to get others to participate in the Wiki and have the audit trail showing other people were active.

Alright, any further comments? I see no hands. Then we will go onto the next item and that is the call for elections. The announcement went out last night, unfortunately it was not premature, but I was a little bit late in getting some additional text in, there is a revised version going out. The additional text was related to the NomCom and if we can pull up the Wiki page, or at least the text that I added to the Wiki page on the elections, you will recall we decided to put some criteria on to NomCom delegates and I consulted with a number of former NomCom people, former current NomCom people, and that's what Olivier was mentioning before about my discussions with them. We put together a set of criteria that I think are reasonable. On the other hand, it also is going to make it really difficult to find good candidates for the NomCom. But, I think it is really important that we treat this quite seriously. Is it possible to get that page up in the Wiki.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. While Gisella is doing that. I have also posted it in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: You've posted it in the chat.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: The Webex chat or the Skype chat?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The Webex.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know what you posted but there's nothing showing up in my thing that's relating to that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Should I read it to you Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I really would like people to see it, or at least put the URL so people can look at it themselves.

HEIDI ULLRICH: OK. Gisella is on the text, it's on the page of the 2018 elections.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you can share your screen, it is the easiest way to do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Actually, maybe I need to refresh my agenda Alan, but when I click the link to do with the elections, I get page not found from the agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the only possible answer to that is sigh. On the other hand Cheryl, I get a page. It may be your tools that are not working properly. Alright, I'm going to read these because we obviously can't look at them. If someone, the link is now in the chat, if someone can click on that to make sure it really works. It does. If you scroll to about a third of the way down, you'll see some text in blue. What we are asking for, for NomCom candidates, NomCom delegate candidates, is familiarity with ICANN groups, ability to judge people such as when interviewing or hiring, I will recount that on the AAFC meetings, the group that is chartered by the ALAC to do selections, we often have the comment of I don't know this person, so I can't make judgements. The NomCom like the AAFC, is expected to work from documents, not always full complete documents, and have to make judgements based on, sometimes, incomplete information, just as one does when hiring people. We are looking for people who at least understand that concept. English is, I've gotten different answers from different people whether you have to be fluent or just comfortable, but the comment

that has been made by a number of people is, if you don't speak English well enough, people don't bother listening to you. That may not be fair, but that is what happens. Good at online skills to find information about people, deep dive tends to be a major part of this process and it's important. Time commitment, people must be willing to devote a substantial amount of the time, particularly in the March to May timeframe, March to June. There's travel involved, and the timelines are tight. Lastly, the ability to work in a group environment, standing up for what you believe, because there will be other people who are very determined, but at the same time a good listener and willing to change when there are good arguments presented and diplomacy is important. These are pretty stringent requirements, I question whether some of the NomCom delegates we've selected in the past would have met them, if we had written them before. But going forward, we certainly need to try to do that, if we want to have effective people on the NomCom. It's also pointed out that reiterating that the NomCom delegates are recommended by RALOs, and they can recommend one or more, but it is the selection of the ALAC and those recommendations are not binding. We have been criticized for not making that clear enough in the past, and I have tried to make that clear going forward. Other than that, the nominations are now open and the procedure will end sometime in May. Questions, comments? I see no hands, I hear no voices. Does anyone know what the red exclamation mark means on the attendee list, that is before number of peoples names? Does that mean they are not really here anymore? I have exclamation marks before Andrei, Barrack, Olivier.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have no idea what it is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl says that she likes these clarification points.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I believe that those are for people who have dialed in separately and have not linked their dial in via Adeco, with the connection on Webex. Webex thinks we are actually not listening or not speaking, because we did not connect via Webex. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. Thank you. That almost makes sense. Barrack is agreeing. Alright, no negative comments, one positive comment, no further comments on these. Then, we will go forward on that, and the group that came up with this by the way, I did ask for volunteers, all but one of the people were past NomCom delegates and although not everyone agreed in the fine details, I had pretty much full agreement on what ended up in that document, so it was achieved in a reasonably balanced way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just for the record, not only do I support all of these, and there I am speaking from my ex NomCom leadership role. But, they are in keeping with the recommendations done by the external examiner as well, the independent examiner as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Now the challenge, honestly is, now to go find people who actually meet these criteria, because the normal process we have of nominating people does not necessarily address these criteria, now that they are written, perhaps it will better. Bartlett says that I certainly hope that we will make it extremely clear that the RALOs only recommend something... I presume it's only recommend people that meet these criteria. But Bartlett if you wrote anything else in the chat it got truncated. I love these tools.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello this is Seun, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Seun, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, I just wanted to [inaudible] ICANN 66, is it going to be 66 by October?

ALAN GREENBERG: ICANN 66?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Where does it say ICANN... can you be more specific where it says ICANN 66.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible] on the timeline of the election. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Timeline. I don't see a reference. I see a reference to ICANN 63, I don't see a reference to ICANN 66.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Let me call it. On the 2018 AGM, in brackets ICANN 66. That's the...

ALAN GREENBERG: In the very first box at the top of the screen?

SEUN OJEDEJI: No, I am looking at the announcements. I am looking at the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: The email announcement you are talking about?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. Hold on.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, I see that mistake. We're sending out a revised note anyway. Sorry for that, I have no idea how that happened.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for catching that Seun. That should have been a cut and paste from the web page that says 63, but apparently not. I guess it means someone is human. Thank you Seun for catching that. Anything else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on election if I may.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just aware that with the liaison we are still listing Julie, as opposed to the new. Surely we should have had that changed. Anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Surely we should have had that changed. Are we also listing Maureen?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That would be a yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. Has staff noted this?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, and thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. If anyone else would like to embarrass us, I will keep the microphone open for another minute or two. Better to be embarrassed on this call than publicly. I see no more hands up, nobody else is calling out. I think it's start of an interesting concept of the people that currently have terms end at the end of ICANN 63, but the new ones don't start until ICANN 66. Maybe we just don't need leaders for the next year. Just a thought.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's how all European countries work like this, without a president for years on end, and they work a lot better like this. I think Belgium was one of them that had no government... anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Remember we have a tradition in at-large to have two governments at one time. Next item on our agenda, if we are finished with elections, is review of the ALAC agenda. We're not really going to do a review, but if anyone has anything that needs to be added, that they think needs to be added to the ALAC agenda, that we have not already discussed or alluded to today, then I will give you ten seconds to make a comment. Yeah, the agenda has not been fully updated but will shortly. We clearly have not made the target of having our agenda set a week ahead of time. Not hearing anything, we will go onto any other business. There are two any other businesses that I have. Number one is as mentioned earlier, there was a commitment to write a report out of the ALT meeting in San Juan. I unfortunately did not get that as early as it should. I do have a draft that will be ready in the next day or so, and I'll be sending it out privately to the people on this call, and asking for anything which I have misremembered or if there is anything that you believe needs to be reported that I have omitted. Just a notice that will be coming and I would appreciate a relatively quick turnaround on it. The last item is there was an ALAC selection committee meeting for community onboarding earlier today, two things. Number one, we did not come fully come to closure. There was a significant discussion and there was far from, nevermind unanimity, not even majority opinion, and the second thing is, I believe, and let me verify this number before I say it, we only had 4 of the 10 AAFC members present on the meeting. I'm going to be making a comment to the ALAC later today that perhaps we need to replace people on this group if they are not going to be able to come to meetings, and some people regularly do not make it to the meetings, that we really need to get people on who are willing to take on the task. The ALAC has delegated selection of people for a large

variety of purposes to this group and essentially has waived, in almost most cases the ALAC ratifies, it very much is a ratification. I have a real problem doing this when the majority of people don't bother contributing to the process, I am just serving notice that I will be commenting on that later on today.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, this is Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. I thought [inaudible]. I would like to make my apology for not attending the meeting today. Somehow it just [inaudible] I also did not see it on the calendar, maybe it wasn't [inaudible], or maybe I just missed it, apologies Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Seun. The comment was not targeted at you in particular. It's been a pattern that we've seen that typically if we get half the people on the call, we're doing well. I just think we need to think about this seriously. The ALAC has given up the responsibility to this group, and on the theory that these people will do it diligently. Everyone will miss a meeting on occasion, it happens, but I think we have to think about it differently if we're going to move forward. Your comment noted. I have nothing else, is there anyone with any other business?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking for the transcript. Just on the point that you've made here, could you please let the RALO leaders know by private email about the attendance records of the people from the RALO. That would be very helpful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes I will. I will do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just strikes me on this topic and to some extent it may be something that we can sort out during the election process as well. Perhaps we need to make it very very clear to everyone who is elected or appointed

to any position, that their attendance record will be a matter of review and scrutiny.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Noted. We do have some problems with some of our appointees, I won't go into the details right now. We may go into them in a closed session at some point, but we do have records that are less than enviable in some cases, and I think we need to think about it seriously. The ALAC rarely removes people from positions, but on the other hand, we have been known to reappoint people who have not done the job as diligently as they should. I think we need to think about this. Further comments? We are almost at the half hour, we have a few more minutes officially, but I'm quite happy to end the meeting a few minutes early and give you back a bit of time. Then hearing nothing, seeing nothing.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Alan, it's Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier please go ahead, last comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I am aware of the topic of metrics and so on, I really appreciate that we start moving on these metrics for [inaudible], and if I could ask staff to send us an email. First, I didn't see a mailing list being put together for

the leadership, so maybe we can do that. Then second, that we share those metrics of at-large too... because I think they might need some time to digest. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. With that, I will call this meeting to an end. Thank you all for your participation. It was delightful to have full attendance, and I look forward to seeing the same on our ALAC meeting in a few hours. Bye-bye.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you very much all for attending this call. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be just disconnected. Please do disconnect your computers as well. Thank you very much and enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]