

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you, we will now officially start the recording of this call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC leadership team teleconference on Thursday 17th May 2018 at 18:00 UTC. On today's call we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Brarrack Otieno, Bartlett Morgan, Yrjo Lansipuro, Alan Greenberg, and I believe we also have now, Seun Ojedeji. We have apologies from Andrei Kolesnikov. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Gisella Gruber, Yesim Nazlar, Evin Erdogan, and myself Andrea Glandon on call management. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. You may now begin.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, did you say we had apologies from Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm here.

ANDREA GLANDON: No, Heidi is on the line. I have apologies from Andrei.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I thought you said Heidi, my apologies and your non apologies then. Alright the first item, substantive item is approval of the agenda, is there anyone who has any questions? You will note that there is an in camera session at the end, it will be on both the personnel issue that's

---

*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.*

---

referenced and one other issue that we need to discuss, and we have some sort of noise on the line. I see we have an action item, an item to review action items, that is not 0 minutes. Heidi, can you take us through that please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you so much. Evin could you please put them into the Webex, I am not in there yet. Alan you have several, which I believe you completed, Alan, 2 drafts. The statement on ICANN reserve fund proposed replenishment strategy.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was done a long time ago.

HEIDI ULLRICH: OK. Alan to draft an informal statement on IPC BC accreditation and access model for non public data.

ALAN GREENBERG: That passed us by, we didn't do it. There is a new model that we could decide something on. We will discuss that under policy, so that one is no longer valid and the third one I see is the report on the ALT meeting, which I do not believe was posted yet, so that is still an action item on my park.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: OK, thank you. Then there are two more, first of those is the ALAC leadership team to determine and submit statement. It's actually more of a statement so I will pass that one by. Then Gisella, over to you for collect confirmations from the ALT regarding attendance and flights surrounding the closed ALT meeting at ICANN 62 which I'm assuming you've done since...

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's talk about that under ICANN 62.

HEIDI ULLRICH: OK. Thank you. Then we are complete Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Next item is policy. Open policies, I'll turn it open to Evin to review them, we will have a substantive discussion on one or two of these, so Evin over to you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you Alan. As you can see on the agenda, there has been three recent statements that have been approved by the ALAC, currently we have one open for comments. There was a draft posted regarding release for registration one dot com domain name with a single character label, o dot com. That policy comment closes on the 20th June, but the first draft has already been posted.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: That I... it's a very short and curt comment and I support it. It basically says that we do not, SSAC does not believe that there are any security stability issues, we do not believe there are any user related issues associated with that. There are already one letter second level domains under a number of other cases, and I don't believe theres any issue there. If anyone has a problem with that, please make a comment on the Wiki and we can go from there. [inaudible] I don't see any hands up so please go ahead.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure, so then CCWG accountability work stream 2 final report was submitted and the vote will close later today, and then we have two comments with pen holders that have volunteered, so they're in draft mode. The first being initial report on review of the customer standing committee, CSC charter. Christopher Wilkinson is the penholder.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, let's talk on that. As of last night there were no comments whatsoever, neither from Christopher nor anyone else. Is there any strong feeling in this group that we need to be commenting on this? I see no hands, I hear no voices, I am taking that nobody particularly cares. Then if you could reach out to Christopher, saying in the opinion of the ALT there is no compelling reason to have a comment, does he believe there is any compelling reason that we should be commenting on this. If you could send an email direct to him and copy me.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure, I will make an AI of that. Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Then as you noted in the agenda item portion, there's the ongoing IPC BC accreditation and access model for non public data. It's not a formal ICANN public comment but version 1.5 was posted last week, I've touched based with Steve and he hasn't given a firm deadline for comments, but I would assume as soon as possible comments will be welcomed.

ALAN GREENBERG: That one is one that I think we should be commenting on, I'm not sure we can come to an agreement on it. Does anyone have any particular interest working on this? It's a critical issue but we haven't got a lot of involvement other than from Hollie. Nobody seems to have an opinion, then we'll just let that one sit and see where it goes. I may make a comment or not. Next.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you Alan, so then skipping to a new public comments request which ALAC needs to make decisions. There are three. The first being draft final report of the RSAC 2 review. Second... if you'd like to comment?

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

You can read them all, then I will talk about them all.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sure. Second being short term options to adjust the timeline for specific reviews. Third being long term options to adjust the timeline of reviews.

ALAN GREENBERG:

OK. On the RSAC review, number one there was significant dissention within the RSAC and dissatisfaction with the review. To what extent that has been ameliorated based on discussions that happened in San Juan is not clear. There was some disagreement, whether the reviewer had focused properly on the right issues and whether the recommendations are valid. I gather there was discussion and I'm not sure what the current position is. I don't think we want to take a strong position on the details, but I think the ALAC should take a strong position on the overall concept. The report goes into some detail on how several of the root servers do not want to do, have anything to do with ICANN, do not trust ICANN, and do not believe there should be any real reliance on ICANN to do anything or any responsibility issues, anything for ICANN. Others are more interested in working cooperatively, it is quite clear that the stability and security of the DNS depends heavily on the root zone members and the root zone operators, and to have ICANN completely separated from that, I feel is exceedingly problematic and I think we need to make a comment saying through whatever mechanism necessary, we need to rethink how the root zone is organized, whether the current organization makes sense today, and the report does talk about this, and there is work going on within the RSAC looking at

---

alternatives, but and also I think we need to make it clear that we believe if ICANN is responsible for the security and stability, then ICANN must have some involvement in making sure the root zone operates well, and whatever well means. If nothing else, the root zone operators are all independent but also all growing older and it's not clear how this root zone will be renewed or make sure that it does the job properly. Comments please? If there are no comments on this then I think we are not doing our job. Cheryl says collaboration inter zone interaction with the root zone operators is very important. Anyone else have anything to say on this? I am happy to write something myself, but I really think this is something that we should have some concern over. No one wants any comments? Evin, please put me down as the tentative penholder. I am certainly willing to give this over to someone else if they want to it over.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Seun, we can hear you, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, thank you Alan. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry Seun, I cannot make out what you're saying.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Please put me on [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will put you on the list of people to work on that. Thank you, glad to have you. Anyone else have anything to add? Alright, we'll go onto the next one. The next one I have some rather personal positions on. I don't know to what extent any of you have seen that the first one is the short term options for adjusting the timeline for two specific reviews, the ATRT3 which has not yet started, the team has not formally been selected yet. Although the call for membership went out many many months ago, maybe even approaching a year, and they are talking about a number of alternatives in either executing the review, delaying it in various ways. There may be some comments on that, the other one is to delay either completely or partially. Either to scrap part of, or delay the whole review of the RDS WHOIS review team, you will recall that that's a review team that I am chairing. This is a public comment which came out Monday, with no advance notice to the review team, leadership or review team that this was being worked on. It proposes to either reduce the scope, and that is to either eliminate some of the things we're working on, or pause the whole review for some indeterminate amount of time. Now the timing is rather interesting, the review, the public comment closes in early July and the analysis will be due near the end of July. The review team current work plan says that we will have our draft review ready, our draft report ready, almost ready to publish at the end of July. They are essentially saying that the work that we have done and will be doing over the next several months, might be cancelled. I find that a rather poor way of motivating people, of asking them to work really hard and diligently, and saying at the same time you're doing the



---

work, we're considering whether we are going to allow it to go forward, or whether to cancel it or not. There's a significant amount of ill will associated with this comment. The review team will certainly be commenting and I will certainly be commenting. I will also be going back to the ALAC and asking for advice, should the at-large members continue under these circumstances. I don't know if the ALAC itself has any particular comment, it might, I certainly won't author it if it does. We might have a comment, however, on the ATRT aspect of it. The second public comment is long term options that is, for instance, if we delay anything, either the RDS or ATRT, how does that impact the bylaw requirement, would they be able to run every five years, and other things related to that. How do we make sure in the future, despite the current bylaws, we do not have too many reviews going at the same time. Someone needs to mute themselves, it seems to be Barrack. I open the floor to anyone that has any comments. Cheryl says, I don't know what she says, I haven't read it all, at least two are only just out but we should make a comment, I think they are impudent and it affects the bylaws and there is good reason to comment on both. I see no hands, hear no voices, then feel free to post something on the Wiki for your thoughts, or if anyone would like to volunteer to draft these kinds of things. I suspect on the ATRT we may have different positions, there may not be a single at-large position, or there might be. Any comments on the policy issues before we go onto other issues.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl here.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just on that. I think there's a clear [inaudible] there's a very large difference in my opinion, at least, between the benefits to our community to delay in the internal review of [inaudible] definitely needs a refresh. That puts pressure on the community, I think we might have a comment back on that sort of thing. It's the other review that I am particularly concerned about [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think you were finished. I have a number of comments on all of these things, number one, ICANN continues to conflate this specific reviews, what were the AOC reviews, with the organizational reviews. Other than having the word review in comment, they share nothing in comment... sorry, other than having the word review and being overseen by MSSSI, they share nothing in common. They have a completely different track record of effectiveness, they have a completely different purpose in life and I believe conflating the two is a significant mistake and ICANN insists on doing that continually. That's part of the problem. I think we will obviously have a strong comment to make on organization reviews, we are insane to keep on scheduling them if we don't understand how effective they are, or are we doing this in a rational way. I think the bylaws need to be in step with the fact that they are not, to a large extent they are not working, they may occasionally work, but as a rule they are not. I think we have a number of comments on the long terms ones, the short term ones as I said, are

---

more interesting and from a very personal point of view, the concept of MSSl working on this planned public comment since San Juan, and we were told we have been working on them, and not involve the active review team in terms of letting us comment on the options presented, or whether it even makes sense to do this, I consider just such an affront to the volunteer community, I think it's just completely unbelievable and I guess it's just another example of how ICANN treats volunteers and the work that they are doing. I just cannot imagine how they could have done this without a heads up and a discussion with the review team that is actively working. As you can tell, I feel rather strongly on this. Anyone else want to weigh in before we go onto the next agenda item? Then the next agenda item is updates from liaisons, there is no requirement for liaisons to give an update, but if there is anything to report that will not be in their written reports, or to highlight something in the written reports that will be due for the ALAC meeting next week, I'll open the floor to any liaisons. Yrjo, please. I see your hand up.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yrjo, I unmuted your line.

YRJO LANSIPURO: OK. Alright, can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

---

YRJO LANSIPURO: OK thank you. Yeah, I'd like to tell you that of the deepening [inaudible] between the GAC and ALAC. I have been invited to attend the conference call of the GAC leadership team on Wednesday, and of course, this is about what should be on the agenda of our joint meeting in Panama. I will be very grateful for your input, what should I say, I have told them already that probably, [inaudible] geographic names, is still something that we want to discuss with them, and also, since at that point it's one month of GDPR, maybe also we can compare notes on that. But, any other items?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Yrjo. GDPR certainly, and one other thing that I want to highlight, which may not be popular with the GAC, but I think we need to raise, is the large divide between the GAC and the privacy commissioners within their countries, and specifically the European countries for the GDPR, because the GAC is issuing advice, which to some extent is counter to what their own privacy commissioners are asking for, and I need to understand this better, and as I said, it may not be a popular thing to raise, but I would like you to raise it with leadership and see what their reaction is.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, I will raise that with them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else have any comments for Yrjo? The other thing that I could put on the table, if we have time, is the ITI, the information

---

transparency initiative, if I have what the acronym stands for properly, and since the joint ALAC and GAC statement... this partially involves that. I would like to understand, to what extent GAC members are active in participating, or commenting on the various ITI initiatives. Certainly the ALAC members have not been and that's something that we probably need to rectify, but I'm just wondering to what extent do they feel that they should be actively involved to helping guide the effort, not only commenting on it. OK. That's something else you could certainly ask about.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Sure. I have a question actually, the question about the root zone and the fact that some root zone operators don't want to have anything to do with ICANN and so on and so forth, you think that this is something that we might find a common interest between us and the GAC.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I personally would not want to raise that because that would be an opening for the... essentially the anti-ICANN people to point out that ICANN is not doing a good job at overseeing the domain name system, and governments or someone like that should do it instead. I am not sure I would want to raise that one, other people may have different opinions but.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

OK.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I see no hands up, I hear no voices. Then, any other liaisons with any comments? Then we seem to have reclaimed the time we lost at the beginning of the meeting. At-large review, there's not an awful lot to say, the indications we get are that the OEC, rather I'm told that the OEC is meeting on I believe the 29th of May. Heidi, is that the right day?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, that is the right date.

ALAN GREENBERG: To discuss the at-large review. I am hoping the outcome of that is that they will recommend that our proposal be accepted as submitted and passed onto the board for its approval. Clearly, the letter from the registrars and registries may well be discussed in their agenda, at this point it certainly could have some effect. I believe that number one, the letter raised two issues, number one that we had not addressed all of the issues in the items report. I believe that is false, I believe we certainly did address all of the issues associated with recommendations and I believe the only issues that are relevant are those which items felt a recommendation was required, and we did address all of those issues, not necessarily agree with them. The other part was that we did not formally answer all of the questions that MSSSI posed in their road map, or mapping, whatever it was called. You may recall that I did create answers to all of them, they were not necessarily polite answers, and we decided that it was not worth our time to do that in depth, because although some of the questions might be interesting, they were not necessarily going to help us in addressing the issues. I still believe that is

---

an accurate statement. I am hoping that that letter is not going to have a major impact on the direction forward, that of course remains to be seen. Cheryl any comments on your part?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nope [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, any other comments from anybody else on the at-large review? At this point it is business as usual, were hoping in approximately a little under two weeks we will have an answer from what the OEC has decided, and there is still a chance, of course, that the board may raise issues and not just ratify whatever the OEC recommends, but there is nothing that we can do other than wait on that one. Or to the extent that you have colleagues who are board members or people who you talk to who are board members, feel free to do whatever you think is appropriate. But at this point it is still in the hands of the OEC.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Just to comment that Leon will be on the ALAC call, on the early part of the ALAC call next week. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. I presume that he may have some words of wisdom for us.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Most likely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything further on review? Next item is ICANN 62 agenda, and I will turn the first part of this over to Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much Alan. Welcome to this lovely section on ICANN 62 and 38 days to go until we meet, hopefully everyone can hear me loud and clear. I've asked Yesim to kindly share the Excel document that I usually use, hoping that she is going to have that up on the screen shortly. I just thought that I'd run through what we currently have on our schedule, but before we do that and all those under agenda item C, if you could all confirm with me just, either in the chat or send me an email to confirm that you have your flight, that you've registered on the website. Also, I have an update on the hotels, what you will be receiving the regular email from meetings team with your hotel reservation, so those are sent down 30 days ahead of time. Hopefully you will start receiving those at the end of next week. Again I'll touch base with you to make sure everyone's [inaudible]. Barrack, with regards to your issue on the flight, we are working on it and I'm in close touch with Joseph to make sure that we get this sorted rather sooner than later, so I am on your case. Unless there's anyone else who would like to make any



---

comments on that, we'll just go straight into the schedule. Sunday, I've just put it on this. You'll see it on Sunday here, we've got the CCWG meeting, nothings changed there, and in the evening the community leaders dinner with the ICANN executives. On Monday after the ethos awards, present by David Oliver Neuron, we'll go into our working sessions part one and part two. Note that I have allowed for a 15 minute transition between the ethos awards and us starting our session to actually be realistic with the agenda. At that time the new gTLD subsequent procedures working group will be running parallel with Alan and Cheryl attending that. Over lunch, we have the session with Theresa Swinehart, strategic outlook trends, identification. That will run for 60 minutes, lunch will be served at the same time for the RALO leaders and ALAC members. We have our afternoon session where we'll be meeting with the SSAC for 45 minutes, and then go into the two cross community sessions. That evening the local host reception is yet to be confirmed. On Tuesday we will start at 9 AM with the joint outreach session. Note that for the first part of the outreach session it will be non conflicting, so the first hour 15 will be non conflicting, and then the second part we'll have our regular working session and at the same time you'll note that on the GNSO column, which is just next to ours, we've got placeholder RDS next steps, according to GNSO support staff a very short while ago the first session will be closed and the other two open. That's all the information I've been able to get regarding those sessions. Over lunch, LACRALO open house. Please note these are also question marks as we're trying to find the best spots for two LACRALO events, seeing as we can't have the LACRALO networking event in the evening. Just a different format with the policy forums, how we are looking at the best options, hence the question mark, and then afternoon ALAC

---

---

session with the two cross community sessions. That evening the regular networking session and Gems taking place, I believe.

On Wednesday we have an 8:30 start, and over the lunch again two placeholders, one for the individual membership meeting, and the other one for the LACRALO networking event, so please at this stage, I've put them in there. This is my working document, but I'll update you as soon as we're able to move the pieces around on the chess board. The afternoon we'll have the joint AFRALO African meeting, again the ICANN academy is unlikely to be at that time, followed by the two cross community sessions, and the reception in the evening. Wednesday evening there is a possibility of an ALAC BBQ, again we're working on budget, on events planning, Alberto Soto has very kindly organized this, so we have a few items got to sort out before we can confirm anything. Thursday we've got an 8:30 start. The GAC have put a 45 minute meeting with us in the morning, which will be during the wrap up one and wrap up two. Over lunch we've got an ICANN 63 kick off. Note there again, we've got the placeholder for the LAC networking event. Again all still work in progress. The first afternoon slot will be the at-large regional leaders, at the same time we'll have the new gTLD subsequent procedures working group, hence having the regional leaders at that time. Followed by the two cross community sessions and the evening closing cocktail. Now the RDS cross community is a placeholder, and I have not yet had any other information from meetings team with regards to the sessions. Friday morning we have the ALT meeting at the hotel in the business center. Details will follow. This is the action item, Heidi, which you mentioned earlier. Everyone is attending except for Bastiaan, who sends his apology. He has to be back in the Netherlands

---

by Saturday. At this stage we're still working on the agenda but I'll hand it over to Heidi and Alan for the main topics identified. If you have any questions or comments, please do ask me now. I haven't read the chat yet, by the way, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a question on the BBQ, is it likely to be inside or outside, given that this is heavy mosquito territory.

GISELLA GRUBER: I believe outside, but I am going to say to be confirmed. I am aware of the fact that there are mosquitos, so it is a question that I've asked, and this needs to be taken into account, otherwise some people will look very red and bumpy the next day. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: One moment Heidi. Panama is malaria zone, although Panama City, I believe is not identified as a high risk area. Yes Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, so he has sent us the venue and it is immediately next to the venue of the conference and hotel. It is part of a incredibly modern skyscraper complex, and I believe it's going to be OK, in terms of mosquitos and particularly malaria carrying mosquitos.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, I believe Panama City is not a high risk zone, but I haven't actually checked that myself.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It is immediately within the venue and it's... we can put the link to it. It's a very modern looking location.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. That sounds more palatable and not a bus ride away is also a rather interesting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well he did say for some reason, we would need some sort of transportation. Why? I am not so sure, but we'll sort these details out.

ALAN GREENBERG: If it's right beside it, you may want to check on that. Because otherwise it sounds like some miscommunication. Anything else on any of the other items? I see no hands, oh I see a hand from Olivier, please go ahead. Can't hear you yet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hi there, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this. Just checking on the lunch, was that meant to be on day 2, because there also might be an internet society lunch on one of the days, we're just trying to work out when. If it's... would that be on the Tuesday, the LACRALO lunch, and is that for everyone or just for LACRALO.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we could scroll to Tuesday please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, Gisella here. As it is now the LACRALO open house is for LACRALO community members and not only within at-large, we're trying to get the wider group here. Again the lunchtimes are likely all to be booked up, but we're still trying to move the pieces around and I'm still waiting for information to be able to nail these meetings down.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But this open house is for LACRALO members only? Not all of at-large, well all of ALAC.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes... No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: OK. Thanks, don't know how I mute now. Ah there we go, it's appeared.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any other further hands, Olivier's hand is still up but I am assuming it is an old one. Alright, the next item on our agenda is the topics that we're looking at and if we can scroll to the agenda item, down a little bit where we have those items listed. We're on the agenda but we're not at the right item yes. Scroll down more so we can see the bottom of 6, little bit up... somewhere in between where you were and where you are. I see. We can scroll within that page, I see. I was told we can't do that. So, the current items that we're looking at placing, whether we'll be able to place them all or not, is not yet clear. Is, number one, at-large review, including a discussion of ALS criteria and individual member issues. Both of which are critical to the implementation of the at-large review. New gTLD issues, and with the understanding that there will be a public comment starting soon on the interim report from the PDP. The trend session with Theresa Swinehart, looking at things impacting ICANN and which ones we should pay attention to and how. GDPR, which could include the accreditation model, the interim policy and the GNSO expedited PDP which is likely to result, and you saw there was a reference to that on Tuesday, that the session that was going to be the current GNSO RDS PDP, which has been put on hold at this point, has been replaced with two sessions, one closed and one open on the E PDP. Cheryl, is there any indication that you will be allowed to attend the closed one?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I have not heard [inaudible]. It should be only [inaudible], but I will double check.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Please. If there is any indication that you're not, I would like to know earlier rather than later. The KSK rollover, we may have a brief discussion on. ATLAS 3, representing the interests of internet users. I think it's time that we started having a conscious and public, not public in the sense but open, an open discussion on why we are here at ICANN. I'm hearing far too many things that really upset me, and really make me worry about the future of at-large, of people not quite understanding why ALAC and at-large exists. We hope to have daily session, discussing what the open, high interest and cross community sessions are, and a brief review of what we will be doing. We will be meeting with the GAC and we will be having a prep session for that, and with the SSAC. Have we missed anything? This is the really critical time, if something's not on this list now, with the grace of the gods of scheduling we may be able to add it, but we really need to know if there is something missing at this point. Or is there anything on this list that you feel is so extraneous we shouldn't try to put it in? Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record, just on the new gTLD [inaudible], worktracks 1 to 5, at least for the work track 5, the geonames. Which are now [inaudible] work for work tracks 1 through to 4, which will be focusing on reviewing particular points of socialization and seeking feedback from the community on points from the interim report that should be released by then, if not shortly after Panama [inaudible] end of May [inaudible]. They're conflicted, which we know they are

---

---

conflicted, with the ALAC meetings, but I do wonder about the rationale of at least having proposed pen holders who are going to be reacting to the public comment questions out of the interim report, at least attending the GNSO sessions on that, it seems very odd if we are in another country while workshops on topics are going on, and we're [inaudible] different topic at the time [inaudible]. Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. It is not clear that pen holders will all be at that meeting, however, that's not withstanding, can you please... I am talking to Cheryl. Can you please look at the block schedule that Gisella presented and make sure that all of the gTLD sessions that you are aware of, are clearly marked on that, so we're not surprised that there's a conflict that we don't know about. In the past, we have missed some on occasions. We blocked out the main ones, but there was another one three days later which didn't show up on our agenda and took us by surprise. Given your position on the PDP, if you can verify, I would appreciate that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I've shared any update on the block schedule, from the GNSO with Gisella. Anything I know, she knows.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright, then I presume that schedule will note any potential conflicts.



---

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, if I may?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Gisella, please go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, I've got access to the GNSO schedule that they're using at the moment, but that's why I actually said that I contacted Natalie shortly before this call, just to say look, what is the update on placeholders, and then on the Wednesday morning, there's a hold for PDP and I'm keeping a close eye, just to see exactly what is being put there and she said the council will no doubt use those slots, or that slot on the Wednesday morning which is free, and hopefully we won't have any conflicting sessions. I will really do my best to make sure that I am up to date daily, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I mean, we're not going to avoid conflicts completely, because there's just no way we're going to accomplish our work if we block out everything that may be of interest. We will be blocking out at least half of our possible slots. But we will try to arrange them for the right topics are in the right place. That's about all we can do. Any other comments on scheduling? Next item is travel and related items, and we have a standing statement saying if anyone believes there is any travel issues, visa issues, or potential cancellations, even if it is not firm that you are cancelling, please let Gisella know as soon as possible so we can take appropriate action if necessary. Other activities we've

---

already talked about, I think, and is there anything else further that we have not discussed on ICANN 62. I'm looking for voices or hands or chat comments. Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, and we are a little bit ahead of schedule. We will go onto the next item which is the at-large elections selections appointments and such. The nomination periods have all closed, I was to be quite blunt, somewhat perturbed with the lack of new names and faces, and the amount of recycling of people, which in my mind anyway seems a little bit worse than normal, but again it is what it is, people have made their recommendations and acceptances, and the ALAC members in three of the regions are decided at this point, Hollie will be continuing in APRALO, Tijani will be continuing in AFRALO, and Bastiaan in EURALO. There are three candidates in NARALO and they are Judith, Jonathan Zuck, and Marita Moll. Two candidates for ALAC in LACRALO, Humberto and Carlos Agüero. I have no other comments on that, that I will make in a public forum. Does anybody have anything else to raise on this point? Or Heidi, do you have anything to raise?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi Alan, no. I am just confirming that we are all ready to announce those ALAC members who were uncontested have won by acclamation, I am hearing that yes, APRALO, so Hollie has won. I just need to double check that there is a consensus call going on in EURALO, which I think may be ending today, if it hasn't already. Has not? On Saturday there is a consensus call, and then also I have written to Mohamed and the AFRALO leadership on their acclamation, but I haven't heard back yet.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I really worry about the need for a consensus call on what happens, if indeed, the group does not agree. We have had one such case in LACRALO which has caused us untold amounts of grief, and I'm really somewhat concerned that we need this process, but rules are rules and in many cases defacto process is not backed by rules, are what they are. We have Cheryl and Maureen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am happy to wait for Maureen, I'm not sure what she's going to say, but I'm sure what I am going to say. Go ahead Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Cheryl and thank you Alan. Maureen for the record. I just wanted to [inaudible] nomination, well the nomination for Hollie's... the recommendation for Hollie to be appointed. We had a big discussion in Puerto Rico about the elections, and what we did, we're actually trying to find somebody who could actually take up the ALAC position and we did offer it to someone we thought would be appropriate, but he refused. Hollie put her name down and was actually very keen, we were doing a lot of working around and shoulder testing, and trying to find people who might want to stand, and she would have pulled out if there had been anyone who would stand. I think this is an issue that we really need to sort of like [inaudible], we're still working on our ALSes and our people within APRALO to try to find people who are interested enough, and also getting them... we're just not getting them into [inaudible] there's such a big gap in what they need to know. I mean, I have to confess in not knowing enough about a lot of the policy areas, and as

much as I read and as much as I try to attend meetings and learn more, it is just too much, and I think [inaudible] outreach which isn't developing. [inaudible] they don't have the experience, they don't have the time, they don't have the practical experience to be able to make an appropriate comment. I mean, we pushed it, it's really an APRALO meeting, [inaudible] but it's just not happening, so we really didn't have any choice and Hollie is keen to do it, but she did say, and she was really quite adamant, it would have been really good to have got somebody else in, if we could. I just wanted to put that in there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Maureen. It's quite clear from our statistics, that one of our real problem, longevity is not necessarily our major problem, not being able to keep people is a problem and of course, not being able to attract new people who actually start working immediately is a real problem, and that's well understood. If you look at our selections as a whole, there are a fair number, a reasonable number of people's names that have been put into the pool. But, I am looking ahead and saying who is likely to get selected, and at this point it is looking like we will have a very low percentage of new people brought into any position in this cycle this year, and the timing of that is just particularly bad in light of the at-large review. In the past we've had some good years, some bad years, but the timing is bad, of course, it will depend on who the NomCom names and whether we have people renamed or new people coming in that will alter the statistics for the 2018 AGM. It just makes it a lot easier for people to poke holes at us, or poke at us. Cheryl please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan, Cheryl for the record. [inaudible] Maureen has just said. I am very disappointed that [inaudible] APRALO call, earlier, yesterday now. It wasn't noted until the call ended, and certainly the continuing chair had disconnected at the exact moment, at the top of the hour. I said I will take my comments to the list, so I [inaudible] I will now, at least be pushing into the APRALO list, and I am going to be publicly saying how extraordinarily disappointed I am [inaudible] out of APRALO, not because of the individual, but such as it [inaudible] for any of them to have effectively continued with on [inaudible] and not encouraging even [inaudible] they are continuing with the [inaudible] for people. It seems like a badly missed opportunity from the regions point of view, and I'm going to be [inaudible] pointed out. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. Any further comments? I see no hands, I hear no voices. Then we will go onto the next agenda item, or the sub item, and that is the selection of the chair. I sent out a message yesterday that I hope addressed all of the issues and was as clear as possible. The desire of the ALAC expressed in San Juan, is that we hold the chair selection as soon as possible, but make sure to include as potential candidates, any new appointees to the ALAC by the RALOs, so once we have all of the candidates identified, and that should be by sometime next week, unless there are any problems in carrying out the election process. There should not be, but we will wait and see what happens. I will then initiate the nomination process for the chair. The rules in our rules of procedure are extremely detailed and very clear, so there are not a lot

---

---

of options. We have to have a two week nomination period, we have to allow for a one week acceptance period, but I am optimistic that whoever is nominated will either accept or decline quickly, and we can eliminate that one week. Then there is an election process that has to be followed. The process is spelled out in some detail, particularly in what happens if there is ties, or if there are any other issues that do not yield a clear answer to the chair being selected. If there are no such problems, we will have the chair selected prior to the Panama meeting, otherwise I am suggesting that will be done at the Panama meeting. There is an opportunity, should the ALAC decide by overwhelming consensus to defer the selection until Panama, regardless of the timing. I am not predicting that, but it is an option we have. I'll answer any questions, but I don't... hopefully I tried to cover all the eventualities in the email I sent out, and thank you to those who complimented me and thanked me for the work I've done in the past, I appreciate the words of thanks. Any comments or questions on the chair selection? See no hands, no comments. It was a good email, someone said, thank you. I will consider this item closed, and we will go onto the next agenda item. Which is the items for discussion at the ALAC meeting next week, and the question is, does anyone have anything they would like to put on? The last two meetings we have managed to have a policy discussion, either very substantive or somewhat substantial. At this point I do not have a specific item on the list, but I'm willing to entertain suggestions. The only item that I am considering putting on the list, is what I call, in this case a policy tsar, although I may not use that term in the formal agenda. Specifically Jonathan has said several times in public, that he believes our policy processes, that partly it's a process problem that we have, that we are not addressing it properly, which has yielded our

---

---

inability to respond, or respond with enough people involved, and I am considering whether we should appoint Jonathan as a committee of one, or maybe a committee of several, led by him to put together a proposal for how we should be doing things. I open the floor to whether that's a good idea to do at this ALAC meeting or not. No comments. Cheryl says perhaps review the title for the public agenda. Yes indeed, although if you have any suggestions for a title I am open. I think I heard Seun and I see Cheryl has her hand up. Cheryl go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought I heard Bartlett, but I could be wrong.

ALAN GREENBERG: Bartlett has his hand up, but I thought I heard Seun, but it might not have been. Cheryl, why don't you go ahead and then we'll go to other people.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: OK. Thank you Alan, I was happy to certainly wait until after your leadership team spoke rather than jump in first [inaudible], your wish. However, [inaudible] as you know I am bitterly committed to policy, and deeply and actively involved in just about, well practically every single policy aspect of what's going on in ICANN, with the exception of one or two, [inaudible]. I am already keen to do whatever works tried. I confidently [inaudible] will be in the regional meeting about getting people actually engaged with what's going on in ICANN, rather than just sort of you, forming sub committees at the regional level. I note coming

---

out of the regional leadership they are now talking about having experts, topic leads, etc. That may work, although I can see the potential for enormous problems coming out of that as well, especially if the expert [inaudible] are not actively engaged with what's going on in the ICANN context. [inaudible] out of the box thinking, and so I'll be more than happy for Jonathan and small team, I prefer it to be a small team to see what they can come up with, because we need to try something, it's sure not working the way it is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, thank you very much. Bartlett next, and Seun, if I did hear you, then you'll be next.

BARTLETT MORGAN: You didn't hear Seun, you heard Bart, but I pretty much put my [inaudible] in the chat, are you seeing it there?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are hearing you.

BARTLETT MORGAN: No I was saying, I put my question in the chat already.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unfortunately in my chat it's already rolled off the screen.



---

BARTLETT MORGAN: I was just looking for clarification of the nature of our role, is it to [inaudible] for how the ALAC is supported to attack policy work moving forward, or is it sort of, lead the policy work itself?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. This is very much a process and organizational issue. I suspect it will focus on how do we get more people actually involved in policy issues, that is participating, given the constraints of time involvement and level of skill needed, and things like that. How can we be better at formulating policy statements about public comments and other things, given the time constraints we have, we have not... I don't believe we have voted on a statement before we have submitted it in ages. We typically only start working on these statements a few days before it is due. We usually only have one or two people involved in the discussion. There are all sorts of ways we can look at things that people can criticize us on and validly. The reality is that is it not that different from some of the other groups in ICANN, where also small numbers of people work on things and they do it at the last moment because there's no choice. The fact that we're no worse than somebody else, I don't think is the most stunning compliment you can give someone. The question is, can we get better. Jonathan has lots of experience in this area, in other parts of ICANN, and if he is willing to think he can do something, then I am willing to let him. Presumably with one or two other people.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, my chats were not coming through to everyone, but I just... in terms of process and timing, I would suggest that any kind of announcement of this, even a discussion be delayed until after the ALAC elections in NARALO which are going on next week. Because if any kind of note about this, it might influence the elections and even call for a revote etc, if this was to come out at this time, in my view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh dear. Probably worth considering. Any other people have concerns in that area? Bartlett, were you finished by the way? He was done, and Cheryl agrees with Heidi on timing. OK, will not be on the agenda next Tuesday.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan if I may. It might be useful just to bring this up during Panama, because then we have the sort of [inaudible] hopefully have the review, the start of the implementation, and this is the perfect timing I think to stress, we have one track policy and one track straight improvements, in terms of process, ALS representatives, members, and individuals etc.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then Heidi, can you move it into the list of topics for Panama.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Absolutely. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] if I can just jump in? It's Cheryl for the record.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am more than happy moving it to Panama, and [inaudible]. It's an ideal opportunity and in fact [inaudible] to the implementation work which I hope we'll be starting shortly after Panama on the last review. The first time a policy process was formalized in real sense, was in fact after our third review. It is an essential piece, it is a foundational piece, and I think it's certainly something [inaudible] needs to be part of it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. Any further comments? Then, Bartlett I am assuming that is an old hand. I see no others, and at this point we need to move into an in camera session, is there anyone on this call who is not part of the ALT or one of the advisors or staff? I don't believe there is anyone on the call, but can we have confirmation from staff there is no one else on the audio bridge?

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes just a moment Alan, I will give you... I want to check some things and make sure the recording is paused, and I will let you know when you can go forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: OK. You can go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The ALT and advisors met in an incamera session to discuss a personnel performance issue, and as chair I was given some recommendations on how I might proceed. The ALT also discussed another issue related to the at-large review and again, no there was no particular conclusion, but I welcome the input that I had from the rest of the ALT on the issue, on how to proceed. With that I will go onto the last item of business. Any other business. There was no one at the beginning of the meeting who suggested any, this is a last call for any other business. See no hands, hearing no voices. I will call this meeting to an end, and I apologize for running 16 minutes over. Thank you all for a good meeting. Bye-bye.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. That concludes today's conference, please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]