

GISELLA GRUBER:

We will now officially begin the recording as well as interpretation. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Tuesday, the 24th of July at 21:00 UTC. On today's call, from the ALAC we have Seun Ojedeji, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Kaili Khan, Maureen Hilyard, Andrei Kolesnikov, Bastiaan Goslings, Sébastien Bachollet, Alberto Soto, Bartlett Morgan, Ricardo Holmquist, Alan Greebnerg, Javier Rua-Jovet, and John Laprise.

Our liaisons, Andrei Kolesnikov, Barrack Otieno, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Yrjö Lansipuro have all joined us as well. On the English channel, we also have John Kennedy Ezeama, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Otunte Otuneh, Dave Kissoondoyal, Adrian Schmidt, Sarah Kiden, Marita Moll, Alfredo Calderon, Joel Thayer. On the Spanish channel, we have Harold Arcos and Maritza Aguero. We also have Alberto Soto, but he has already been mentioned under the ALAC. On the French channel, we have Gabriel Bombambo Boseko, and Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong.

Apologies today noted from Yesim Nazlar and Kris Seeburn. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Evin Erdogan, Claudia Ruiz, and myself, Gisella Gruber. We have French, Spanish, and Russian interpretation in our call. On the French channel, we have Camilla and Isabel, on the Spanish channel, Veronica and David, and on the Russian channel, Yuliya and Maya.

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

---

*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.*

---

reasonable speed to allow accurate interpretation. Thank you very much, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Gisella. Is there anyone who has either Any Other Business or any other comments on the agenda? Seeing no hands, hearing no one, I'll assume the agenda is accepted as distributed, and we'll go on to the very first item. The first item is review of action items. I see there are zero minutes associated with it, so I take it there is nothing that requires the action, involvement of the ALAC. Is that correct, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. It is.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Then we'll go on to the first substantive issue, and that is ALAC policy activities. As you all know, this is far from a quiet time of year. It's summer in some part of the world and it's supposed to be quiet, but ICANN doesn't seem to believe in that. Evin, can you take us through where we are in this?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sure. Thank you, Alan. Hello, everyone. On the agenda, we see the first three statements that have been ratified, adopted by the ALAC since the last ALAC monthly call. So the current statements in process, the first one is ICANN seeking community feedback on the proposed unified

---

access model. That's currently in drafting mode, and there are to-be-confirmed penholders.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And Evin, this one and the next one we'll hold aside and talk to at the end of the review.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Okay. Then I'll move on to the third one, which is open data initiative datasets and metadata, and that closes on the 27th of July, and it's in drafting mode and you're the penholder [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We've had very few comments on that one. There've been a few. I'm going to be working on that over the next couple of days, and we'll post something. If anyone has anything they want to contribute to it, however, this is a really good time to do it. I'm on a plane for the next 12 hours or so, so while I'm not looking at it is a really good time to make some comments. Other than that, let's go on to the next item.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Okay. Next one, there is a draft posted currently by the penholder, Maureen Hilyard. It's the draft proposal of a new fellowship program approach, and this one also closes on the 27th of July. A call for comments has been issued, and that closes on the 26th of July.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Maureen, do you have any comments on this one?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, thank you, Alan. No. [inaudible] very pleased with the input. And I think we've got a pretty comprehensive sort of setup. So I'm pleased. [Yes, we'll just] move on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: In my ideal dream world, I dream we're going to have that level of participation on policy statements. And I look forward to you as chair and making that happen. Next item, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you. Next one also has a draft posted in the space. And actually, earlier, just a moment ago, one of the penholders, Sébastien, posted an updated draft in the space, version two, short-term options to address the timeline [for] specific reviews, and that closes on the 31st of July.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And in [light with] the title, it's a very short statement, and I do ask people – especially anyone who has a particular interest in ATRT or accountability – to take a look at that and see whether it matches what you believe ALAC should be saying, if there are any modifications or if we need to represent variability, then we're on a short timeline on that one. Next item, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Next one is related to this, on the long-term options to address the timeline of reviews. That's also closing on the same date, 31 July, and that's in draft mode.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that one is one that I am holding the pen on. I did draft – not quite a statement, but essentially, some bullet points of what I believe the statement should say. I think there are still some things that are missing from it that we may want to consider, and I again ask people to look at that, add to my comments, and I will finish that, probably not before the next weekend. But it will be done well before the 31st.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Next one is initial report on the new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process-overarching issues and work track one through four. This one will be discussed on the CCWG call tomorrow. And the assigned penholder so far is Jonathan Zuck. This one closes on the 5th of September.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Thank you very much, Evin. That one, it sounds like far away, but we are already a third of the way into the comment period, and we haven't really started work in earnest on this one. And I have just some concern that we are going to be able to address this one properly. And I'll remind everyone, the importance of this comment is this is not a traditional draft report in that it doesn't give its recommendations and

---

---

say, "Tell us if they're right or not." It, to a very large extent, asks a lot of questions, presents a lot of options, and is looking for community input on the way forward.

To the extent that we provide that input, it may or may not be addressed. And if it isn't addressed to our liking, we have options of making statements on the next report, on the final report, or to the board in the form of advice. If we do not contribute to this in substance, we really have not a lot of power behind us in later on complaining.

So it's really important that we not only address the issues that are important to us – and some of them may not be important to us. There are whole parts of this PDP that really don't matter from a user perspective, and I think we're fine to just ignore them completely. There are other parts, however, which I think are of great interest, and if we don't take this opportunity to say where we need to go, then, as I said, we're in a very weak position moving after that. So I look forward to this coalescing quickly and getting drafting work started. Evin, back to you.

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd turn it over to Jonathan, but I don't think he's on this call.

HOLLY RAICHE: I have my hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I'm sorry. I am scrolled down on the list and I didn't see your hand.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see two hands, you and Tijani. What would you like to comment on?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, just the easiest way into it actually is there's a thing called Annex C with all of the recommendations, some of the options. It would be really useful if even people just skimmed through and identified what issues have been raised that they believe are important for ALAC. Even just having that list would be really helpful so that we can all agree on what issues we concentrate on, because I absolutely agree with you, Alan, there are things in there that are not important to users. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And we're going to have to be really picky in deciding which ones are important. We may have opinions on a lot of things even though they're not important to users. I think we're going to have to make hard decisions on whether we bother raising those at the expense of putting energy into it when it could be focused somewhere else. Tijani, please go ahead.

---

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. You said you would hand it to Jonathan if he was present. Why? Did Jonathan [inaudible] Jonathan is a –

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Tijani, you're cutting out.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible] to deal with this very issue. Did he work on it before? [inaudible] why you mentioned Jonathan here? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani, you were cutting out, so I think I only heard about every third word. But if I understood correctly, you're asking –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry, I'll repeat. I said – you said you would turn it to Jonathan if he was present. I asked you why. What is the [inaudible] of Jonathan for this very issue?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The reason I said that is, number one, he has been assigned the penholder – the overall penholder, not necessarily the one that's going to draft the actual text, and he is co-chair of the CPWG which is the group that's going to be overseeing discussion and organizing the addressing of this particular public comment.



To what extent he has [in this] before, he in fact does have some knowledge of this in a fair amount of ways, partly because of his activities in the last round of gTLDs, and partly because he chaired the CCT Review Team. So I think he does have some particular knowledge. But I referenced him here in this case because he is identified the penholder and is co-chairing the working group. Do you have any follow-up on that? I guess not. Evin, are there any more items before we return back to the top two that we passed over quickly?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Just one final one. There's a draft posted for the initial report on the protection for certain Red Cross names in all gTLDs, policy amendment process, and that closes on the 31st of July.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I don't believe there have been any comments on it other than ones in support of the statement. I may be wrong, I haven't looked at it recently. As a follow-on to Tijani's question, to be clear, Jonathan is listed as the penholder because that's what we call the person overseeing it. In this case, it is a misnomer, because he is not likely to be the author of the bulk of it, although he may well step up to some parts of it, but is simply the person responsible in overseeing the process.

And the items we skipped over at this point are the IPC BC accreditation and access model for nonpublic data, and ICANN seeking community

---

feedback on the proposed unified access model. We've had particularly little discussion in any real concerted effort. I know Holly has been working on it, and a number of other people have been discussing it with her.

But I'll point out that the EPDP, we don't know how the EPDP is going to unfold. We do know that there are less than three months for the EPDP to come up with a draft report. We also know there are significant people who are predicting failure of the EPDP. One of the possible methodologies the EPDP could use is to essentially look at the accreditation model and the unified access model, which are documents and pieces of work that exist today, and look at them and figure out to what extent do you want to pick those parts and use them. In other words, repurpose those in what the EPDP will be designing instead of doing things from scratch. We know how unsuccessful the RDS PDP was in doing everything from scratch.

So we've been talking an awful lot about supporting the EPDP team and a shadow group to work on that. But the existing pieces of work, specifically the accreditation and access model and the unified model, are things that the EPDP may well be drawing upon. So we really need focus on those as well, and we need it really quickly. And Holly may have some ideas on how to orchestrate that to happen. I'm not sure.

I'll give the floor to Holly if she wants to speak for a minute. But I think it's a vitally important area that the ALAC and At-Large should be working on, and I've seen, unfortunately, very little action on it at this point. Partly because they're not formal public comments with a formal ending date. But they're quickly evolving things, and I think if we want

---

---

to influence them, we have to do some work on it. Holly, do you have anything to add?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yes. What I was thinking – and we can talk about this in the working group tomorrow – is somebody – probably me – going through the comments that were made. Let me back up for those who haven't lived and breathed this stuff. Part of the issues involved will be under what circumstances should what groups of people have access to what data. And all of those three are sort of unknowns to be decided. But it's really critical.

Part of the issue is about access, about who gets access and how they get it. There have been some comments, but those have to be taken into account in terms of the overall EPDP. So it's almost as if it would be nice if people didn't comment on the access thing and just focused on EPDP. But Alan, I was going to suggest – would it be useful for everybody even to just have a webinar or something that gives people a roadmap for the ones who haven't lived and breathed this stuff? Just a kind of a, “This is where it all fits in, this is what the temporary solution was, this is what the interim solution is, this is what the EPDP is going to do.” Otherwise, people –

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm sorry. I wouldn't go back as far as the interim compliance model, because that's dead and gone with the temporary specification.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: But talking briefly about the temporary specification – because I think people now know what that is, and talk about the IPC BC work.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: And preferably without cursing it because of where it came from. Because at this point, it is a sizeable piece of work, and much of what they have done is going to be there regardless of who gets their way on the details. And also on the unified access model, because that's what ICANN is putting their money on right now, and we have to understand what it is. So I would say a webinar on those two with a little bit of an intro on the temporary spec is probably something we should be orchestrating with great haste.

HOLLY RAICHE: I totally agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless we understand those, I don't think anyone's going to understand the EPDP.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, totally agree. In fact, Tijani, maybe we can have a really crash course or a crash webinar of two, three, four of us, just so that everybody understands where everything fits together. And it will make comments a lot easier for people to get their head around. I think that'd be useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, it is programmed, a webinar, but there is a problem now. You know that now it is the summer, and my fear is not to have sufficient attendance. But if [inaudible] August, I will organize [inaudible] But I'm not sure people will come. So – but it is programmed. We have this webinar to be done at the beginning of September normally. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. I would suggest you want to push that up as soon as possible. But I think there are two issues that are competing. Number one, you have to give the people who are going to present it enough heads up time so that they can present something really good. And at that point, even if no one shows up, we have it on file and we can point people to it. And as people come into this CPWG activity to try to work with the EPDP team, I think that review of that kind of webinar, and perhaps one or two other, is going to be sort of the mandatory ticket they're going to have to pay to go in.

---

So even if no one attends and there are no questions, having that sooner rather than later on file so it's usable, I think, is a really good thing. Olivier, please go ahead. And we're going to have to move on after that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In fact, I was going to say that the CPWG was thinking of having maybe not a full webinar, but at least some kind of a starting point, starter kit for everyone to take part in and to be able to follow. So I guess a webinar earlier rather than later, maybe as early as sometime in August, in early August would be very helpful. Not only for our people that are going to be part of the EPDP, but for everyone else since we are all here as a team to support them. So it would be great to be all on the same page. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Clearly, we're not going to do anything before the end of July, given that the end of July is a little over a week from now, or perhaps just a week from now. But yes, I think we have to start organizing this quickly. Tijani, last call.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you very much. I will try to do it in August, as soon as I find availability of interpreters and of speakers. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Alright. I think we have completed policy issues. Are there any last comments on policy issues before we move on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, I just want to say that I'm on the line if [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry?

JONATHAN ZUCK: If there are any questions that are still lingering.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I think you're starting to feel a fire being built under you. My only comment.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   That's fine.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:           Alan –

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   I didn't realize that was on the agenda for this call, but we're going to, in the CCWG, start parceling out the subsequent procedures comments.

ALAN GREENBERG:               Well, I'm not sure you want to parcel out until we decide what we're doing or not. But maybe parceling it out [at the same] parallel is not a bad thing. Judith, you had a comment on policy issues?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:           Yes. Who's taking the lead on the ITI? I know I'm slammed and I can't do anything this week.

ALAN GREENBERG:               I'm taking the lead. I know –

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:           But I know that's too soon.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe my name is on it. I may be wrong.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And I think that – is that all [to do] Thursday? Friday, I mean.

ALAN GREENBERG: Evin, can you help us, please?

EVIN ERDOGDU: The metadata comment is closing on the 27th of July. I believe that's a Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's next Monday.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I believe my name is on it. Is that correct?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Correct, yes. I can't see it for some reason, but I'll believe you. Remember, this is not a comment on everything about ITI. It's some specific comments.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It's Friday, isn't it?

ALAN GREENBERG: 27th is Friday.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, it's Friday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we may be a little bit late. And if so, we'll ask for permission.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Judith. Have we lost Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I was done. I put my hand down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Fine.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So I'm here, but I finished my comment. That was it.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. If anyone has anything they'd wish to contribute to that comment, please post it on the wiki. Javier, please.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Yes. Quickly, just to remind Work Track 5 members and anybody who wishes to join that we have a call in a few hours, 5:00 UTC, 25th July, so some hours from now. But it will be my 1:00 AM. So just be aware of that. The link, I'll paste it in the chat again for everybody. Bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Not quite on topic, but thank you. Any further comments on policy issues before we go on to the next agenda item? Seeing nothing, then back to you, Evin, on membership.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. So for the ALSes, as you can see on the agenda, there's a snapshot. There was a new ALS recently accredited by the ALAC, which is a new LACRALO ALS. So the total is 229. We have currently two more ALSes awaiting regional advice from their RALOs, and there are six applications currently undergoing due diligence. Three of them are awaiting applicant feedback on additional questions. Those are also listed on the agenda. And for individuals, we have had one more individual certified from NARALO, so the total number is 76, and one more applicant from an individual from AFRALO. And that will be discussed on the next AFRALO call, [I assume.] And there's also a LACRALO orientation call to be scheduled, likely the first week of August. So that's coming up soon. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Given our new focus on individuals, both within ALSes and unaffiliated, it'd be nice to see these numbers start growing more. However, that's just my wishful thinking. Next item on my agenda is reports from liaisons, RALOs, or anyone else who believes there's something important that needs to be brought to our attention. Reports are normally filed electronically, and we presume people read them. But if anyone has any particular issues, please raise your hand. And I see Javier is first in line.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Old hand, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Old hand. Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And I wanted to comment on the previous thing. I had my hand up. On the review of ALS and individual member. I'm looking at the individual members. Evin, are you asking the chair of the EURALO Individuals Association about figures for Europe? Because these are wrong. They're out of date. Thank you.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. I can follow up to confirm. Is it something that is listed on the Individual Users Association website? Or I can follow up [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: You can take that offline.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. And of course, as the ALAC liaison to the GNSO, I dare to take you all back to policy again, because it's kind of what GNSO do. However, I did want to, for the record, just mention a few parts to highlight [inaudible] There's an enormous amount of background information coming in over my phone. I hope I'm audible. It shouldn't be my muting issue. Somebody certainly needs to mute though. It's really very distracting, that noise.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just so we have Donald Duck talking along with you. Go right ahead.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Well, I'm just going to take my headset off, otherwise I will literally go crazy, [or] crazier. Right. Let me try that again. Only slightly better. The activities at the last ICANN meeting, ICANN 62, were a very different way from the GNSO council's approach to meetings.

And as a policy meeting, in inverted commas, GNSO council minimized its own meeting style and meeting usual ways and devoted whole blocks of time – as in full days, but separated over different days – to most of their ongoing PDP processes. I think as a mechanism, even with the sword of Damocles [engraved] with the temporary specification EPDP hanging over all of our heads [at that time,] and a lot of meeting time was devoted to that as well.

I think as a mechanism, it actually works very well. And in saner times, perhaps the ALAC at some future point might want to look at treating the meetings throughout the year, the face-to-face meetings, in very different ways. Certainly, I think it'd be something worth exploring, perhaps in a capacity building method. But that all worked well, and I wanted to report on that.

From that, I also wanted to compliment all of you. I mean, we're a lot of ALAC and At-Large who engaged so positively in the workshop-style activities for subsequent procedures in particular, but most of them in general, and compliment, of course, Javier for the work that he did not only in Work Track 5 but also his role in the Work Track 1 to 4. And he really is doing a fabulous job on [your behalf.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You have less than one minute for this call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's very exciting. The 19th of July meeting, you may be forgiven to think the only thing that was on the agenda was the motion to initiate the expedited policy development process, which of course you all know by now did happen, and Kurt was confirmed as the independent chair of that. But in case you didn't notice it, another motion actually went through, and I wanted to make sure you're all aware of that, because it's something that was of interest to ALAC in the past.

That was that we received the final report of the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms PDP Working Group. It's the intention of council to now look at that report and deal with it in its August monthly meeting. But obviously, one of the first thing it needs to do is look at the GAC advice and look at any [loose matches] between the GAC advice and what's proposed in the report. So GNSO council has resolved to work with GAC and advise the board what's going on with that. That's it from me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. As someone who hasn't focused at all on the rights PDP, are they recommending substantive change or just tweaking?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They're recommending what could be considered substantive change from the GAC's point of view, because it looks at two possible options, if memory serves me correctly, on the issue of IGO jurisdictional immunity. And with that, GAC has comments which are at, dare I say,

---

almost [inaudible] to those that were put in during the initial report on this process. So the handling of jurisdictional immunity may still be something that needs to be considered and smoothed over. And I guess the other thing is that we should note that the PDP working group really has tried extraordinarily hard to balance the needs and concerns of the IGOs along with the rights of registrants. And I think that was something that is a change, I guess, for want of a better word, from the initial report. There are only five, I think, maybe six consensus recommendations. You're testing my memory banks here. [inaudible] focused. But there is in fact a couple of minority statements, [as you will,] and I cannot say [I've read these] minority statements.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I was just looking for a quick overview. Thank you. Yrjö.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yes. The GAC appointed in Panama a GAC liaison to ALAC. That is a counterpart of me, and that's of course a great development in our relationship. [inaudible] the GAC liaison to ALAC, and that is Ana Neves from Portugal. We have been talking about preparing. So the first draft for a follow-up to the joint statement, joint ALAC-GAC statement on [influent] and inclusive participation in ICANN [efforts,] and that's something that we try to put together so that it can be discussed both in the GAC and the ALAC before the Barcelona meeting. Thank you.



---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Yrjö. Can staff find out who it is who's talking, and perhaps mute them? Or it may be an interpreter line leaking through into the English. We'll listen to them to see if we can figure out who it is. No. Alright, if there are no further comments on reports, we'll go on to the first item in the next section, and that is request from RALO leaders regarding the CROP review team. And I'm going to call upon Olivier to present this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. The CROP review team. At present, it's the same members that are part of the CROP review team that performs a review of each application made by each RALO for a CROP trip. It's also got CROP representatives which are these community representatives that are registered with ICANN staff that are effectively the liaison for each one of the RALOs to be able to talk to ICANN staff, etc.

What we are proposing as the RALOs is to abolish the CROP review team. So the committee would still stand with having representatives who would be interfacing with CROP staff, but the committee would not be performing the task of reviewing the requests made by each one of the RALOs, which means that me as a EURALO person would not be reviewing the NARALO requests or the AFRALO requests, and vice versa. So every RALO would be in charge of their own requests, and of course, the requests that are made are made in such a way that they do get checked out anyway by CROP staff afterwards whether they don't follow any of the rules of CROP as such.

---

So since this committee was created by the ALAC, I understand, the requests from the RALOs and from the people who are involved in CROP is to ask the ALAC whether the CROP review team could be abolished. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. I believe it was created when you were chair, so perhaps you should know. But that doesn't really matter. I thought I understood what was being requested, but then you confused me. You said the group would still exist, but they would not review applications.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That is correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest what you're saying is that the five coordinators may talk to each other on occasion, may even on occasion have a formal teleconference with each other, but they would not exist as a committee, and certainly not something called a review team. Am I interpreting this correctly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I understand there are ten coordinators, two per RALO, and they are the same as the review team people. So whether we want to reduce the ten coordinators to five coordinators or whether we want

---

to keep the makeup of the coordinators the same is something to be discussed.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. The term “coordinators” only came about after the review team, so I'm not quite sure exactly when that term was created. The CROP review team at one point was created with five members from Outreach and Engagement and five members from Finance and Budget. So I'm not quite sure when they became the coordinators with that tile. But it doesn't really matter at this point. Are there any tasks that you see these coordinators will have to do as a group? Not just exchange information, but any real tasks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Alan. Just thinking off the top of my head, as a group I do not know. Although it is worth having the ability for these people to be able to talk to each other on a platform, and certainly for them to be able to address the CROP staff as one, if you want, rather than just each one on their own side.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. May I suggest to keep this clean, we abolish – or we ask the ALAC to abolish the CROP review team. If you want to recoallesce with some other name or simply have a mailing list by which you communicate without a name –

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan –

ALAN GREENBERG: For the group, then I would suggest you want to think of that. We do have a speaker list, and I'll be going through it. Tijani.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, but –

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, we'll come to you next. Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: We cannot hear you, Tijani.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: While that [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, why don't you go ahead while Tijani – we're trying to figure out how Tijani to speak.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, hi. Olivier [inaudible] there's a little confusion in that –

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but Judith is talking. We'll go to you next, Tijani.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [inaudible]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you hear me now?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Tijani, I'm talking, and you'll go next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Tijani, [you'll go next.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Would someone please send him a message?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. So what happens is that the CROP liaisons are needed to sign off on CROP applications. So for each RALO, we need to approve the

---

applications and then direct them to GSE for signoff. So the CROP liaisons are still needed. What Olivier is saying is that the discussions and the ability of the CROP liaisons to approve or disapprove other RALOs' applications is what he's closing down, not the CROP liaisons, which are the CROP program coordinators.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: On the link that Silvia sent, it says program coordinators. ICANN gave that a name.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, thank you. I [don't think] we need to care whether they're called coordinators or liaisons. Is the relationship within the RALO and to GSE, but not with the other RALOs as a formal responsibility? I think that is the consistent message we're getting from everyone. Tijani, can you speak now? Alberto. We'll go to Alberto next.

---

ALBERTO SOTO: After Judith's explanation, I am more confused now. Let me give you one example. Right now as an ALS, now I have a CROP project. I send it to my RALO leadership. The RALO then will analyze it, will send it to the CROP team, and the CROP team, if it approves it, will send it to the GSE. What I don't really understand is what is the difference with what she said and the current process. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have I been dropped, or is there no sound, no one's speaking?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, can I answer that? Since he asked the question to me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, go right ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, the answer is –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello, do you hear me?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, Tijani. The answer to Alberto's question is that currently, there's an additional step, the step we have before we can send it to the GSE.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me? Alan, do you hear me? Hello?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Tijani, we hear you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, I think I understand it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'll try to summarize it after Tijani speaks. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello. The program coordinator, Alan, is part of the CROP program. The CROP program states that each constituency, means that the NCUC, NCSG, etc., for the GNSO, and each RALO has to appoint one or two coordinators. And it was always like this. It doesn't have anything to do with the CROP review team. So those two persons are officially the



---

coordinator of the program [from the start.] Yes, we added the review team just to harmonize, to make all [inaudible] Okay. So this is [inaudible] The coordinator, that is not a choice, it is an obligation. And if there is no coordinator, the program will not work. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. If I may try to summarize, what I believe Olivier was suggesting is that the RALO chairs in coordination with the Outreach and Engagement people within each RALO have come to the conclusion that there is no need to have a central group reviewing applications from all regions, the group that we call the CROP review team. We are not talking about what other structure is still needed, we're simply saying we do not need the CROP review team which was currently constituted of Outreach and Engagement and Finance and Budget people and had a responsibility to review CROP requests from every RALO. Is there any disagreement with that? Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. I'm certainly not disagreeing with that, I was just going to make the point that in fact when we put together the review team, the nature of CROP was extraordinarily immature. It is no longer immature, it has firm, fast and well-tested and indeed frequently updated rules, and equity issues are not going to be a problem. So I for one absolutely support the motion to – however you downgrade to nothing, to remove from activity, to decommission the entity known in the ALAC as the review team. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Judith, do you have something to add to this?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think when we – currently, the review team and the program coordinators or liaisons are the same ones. We still need the liaisons, and they are still the same people. And I think we need to [inaudible] that. [Dissolving] the review team is handy because mostly, it helps At-Large look good in that when we [staff documents] that are poorly written, [as almost mistakes,] we can catch them before they get to the CROP people, and that makes At-Large look bad. And that was the purpose of the review team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Judith. I believe the RALOs have all said that they believe they can do a responsible job themselves without getting input from the other RALOs. That is the substance of this request. Olivier, please go ahead, and then Sarah, and then I'd like to close the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And indeed, I think you got it quite right. End of the CROP review team whilst keeping the CROP program coordinators. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And whether they are called liaisons or coordinators, and what they do in their own right, in their own RALO or communicating

---

with GSE is not an issue. If these coordinators/liaisons need to talk to each other, we will make suitable arrangements.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ICANN calls them program coordinators. We cannot change that name. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And other people have insisted they're called liaisons. I don't want to debate it here. And after I closed the queue, Maritza put her hand up. Maritza, please, a very brief statement if you have something to add to this discussion.

MARITZA AGUERO: My question specifically is right now in LACRALO, we have the problem that two people no longer belong to the CROP team. And so the question is, how can we centralize this information? How can we appoint new people who will be able to review these issues responsibly? Just considering that this is a request from the community when they present these requests and they need to assess and then issue some kind of response before the GSE. Can you please orient me in this regard? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Maritza. As far as I know – and please, someone correct me if I'm wrong – whoever is responsible for handling CROP requests for each RALO is selected by that RALO's leadership. And if you are part of

---

that leadership, you should be able to say who it is that's doing this. If you can't, I think you have a significant problem. And in that case, we should handle it offline. I would like to bring the question to the ALAC right now. Can I have confirmation from staff of how many ALAC members we have on the call?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan –

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan –

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alright. All 15 ALAC members are present. Hadia did join us on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Olivier, is this a new hand you want before I put the question to the ALAC? Olivier? Maybe we've lost Olivier. His hand is down now in any case.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It was an old hand, sorry.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Okay, the issue before the ALAC is whether we should abolish the CROP review team, the group that was constituted to review [CROP] RALO requests before submitting them to GSE. This is being requested by all five RALOs, and I do not believe there has been substantive general support for keeping this group, and it has been an issue that has been clearly problematic over the last number of years, especially with different people believing what it was supposed to be doing and not.

So this is a question to the ALAC. Do we abolish the CROP review team? We are not speaking about what is left to handle CROP requests or whether they get together in a group to jointly discuss things. Is there anybody who wishes to abstain from this question? Hearing no abstentions, is there anyone who wishes to vote against it? I have heard no abstentions, I have heard no votes against it. Then I will assume that everyone else – which is the entire ALAC at this point – is in support of it, and the motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. It's good to actually get some work done. We are now somewhat overtime, and therefore we are going to have to make it up because I have a very hard stop at the end of this meeting, and I was hoping to finish it early.

The next question is one that has been problematic for quite a while, and it is the ratification or selection of NomCom delegates for the 2018-2019 Nominating Committee. You will recall that there were issues raised by some ALAC members with concerns for some of the candidates that were suggested by the RALOs. We had an in-camera meeting in Panama and a decision was reached. Within a short amount of time after that meeting closed, there were people who were stating that they did not agree with the consensus that we had come to and

wanted to do something else. Therefore, we did not follow the decision that was made in the in-camera meeting.

The ALT discussed the issue in its meeting on Friday after the ICANN meeting ended. The ALT came to a conclusion on how to move forward. In ratifying that I had all of the details correct with the ALT, there was disagreement in the ALT about whether indeed that is the way people wanted to go forward. I attempted yesterday at the ALT meeting to come to another agreement, not unrelated to the first one but similar, based on a number of individual discussions that were held in the interim, and we ended up with an essentially 2-3 split in the ALT.

Now, I don't mind making a recommendation to the ALAC from an ALT with one ALT member disagreeing, but if there are two, I do not believe that is enough of a firm recommendation from the ALT to say it's an ALT recommendation. So we're in a quandary at this point. One of the things that seems to be consistent from the discussions within the ALT going forward is that because there has been some level of controversy over this, if we are going to appoint someone to the NomCom as a delegate – this is a really important job – that if we're going to appoint someone, it should be someone who has the support of the ALAC. That doesn't necessarily mean unanimous support, but has strong support.

So the ALT did recommend a supermajority of two thirds. There has been disagreement over whether it is two thirds of the ALAC or two thirds of those who have voted. Because of abstentions or no voting, those numbers can be radically different. Can we put up the document that I have circulated and is attached to the agenda, please?

Now, I'm providing the ALAC with two options today, one of which is to delegate to the chair to decide on the methodology that the ALAC will use for selecting the NomCom delegates. It'll be pretty close to the other option that I'm presenting anyway. But it says we're not going to have a big debate, you delegate it to me. Fine. Because I cannot go to the ALT and ask for ALT recommendation, because the ALT is somewhat split.

If the ALAC decides today that you do not want to delegate to me, then I will put a vote to the ALAC to select option A or option B. Option A and option B will both entail, when we finally try to select people, five votes, one per region, for someone to be ratified or appointed as a NomCom delegate, they will need to get a supermajority, and the differences between the two options are the differences that the ALT has disagreed on.

Specifically, option A says to be ratified, you need a supermajority of the ALAC. Since there are currently 15 people on the ALAC, that means you need 10 people supporting it. Option B is we use the standard rules of it is a supermajority of those voting. Our rules of procedure says that in a vote like this, the vote is not valid – to be valid, at least five people must cast a substantive vote, yes, no. And that means a supermajority of that means four people on the ALAC. If enough people either don't vote or abstain, four people can ratify that someone be put onto the NomCom.

So at this point, I am asking the ALAC. First, anyone to speak, then I'll take a poll of the ALAC. Do you want option one, or option two? Option one says I'll simply decide, and I'll send a message simply saying how

---

---

we're going to do it. Option two says there will be a vote for the ALAC to pick 2.A or 2.B. I'll open the queue now. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Alan. First of all, I want to tell you that I don't care who will be selected. Yes, I care, but I don't care.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're both in the same position, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, but maybe it's more important for me to say that [for some reason.]

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And really, you can not trust me, but I really feel that. My first question, sorry, Alan, it's one vote per member, I guess, and not one vote per region if I understood well –

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry –



---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, Sébastien, what I was saying there is when we come down to a vote to actually say yes or no to a candidate, there will be five individual votes. We will deal with each candidate separately, so you can choose to not even vote on a candidate from one region but vote on a candidate from another region. So there will be five votes. And of course, there will be 15 votes within each of those things. 15 ballots.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Okay, thank you. I think it's important because it could be – and I was reading that as the contrary. But that's okay, I agree with that. My point is that I hope that whatever we decide, all of us will vote, and therefore it's a [byzantine] discussion just to have some – but I guess in the situation where we are, I guess A is better. But my point is just to tell that I don't like when we come to a decision that outside of the meeting, something happens to change the decision. I really don't like that.

If we want to change the decision, we need to gather again the same people and to make – and explain why we changed the decision. I have reason why not to change the decision, and I was not able to give to anybody the rationale I have. And I can't give it because we are not in a closed room now, but I really think that it's a bad precedent if something is changed and not changed by the same people who take the decision. And I'm sorry for that, but I really strongly think it's not a good idea.

---

And my last point is that on the board – and I know that it’s maybe not the best way you want to do, but an abstention is considered as a no vote. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. In most places in ICANN, an abstention is considered a no. We’re unique in general. The only exception we normally have is on the selection of ALAC chair, where the rules – and there may be another case somewhere in our rules where the rules explicitly say it requires a majority of the ALAC members. So we count yeses only to see whether it passes or not, in which case both abstentions and not voting at all are clearly not a yes.

before Tijani goes on, let me make something clear, because perhaps it wasn’t. When I talk about the decision of the in-camera session, the concern raised after the meeting was that we had done something somewhat improper in that meeting. And that was my fault, and I take responsibility for it. So I think recanting on that one is reasonable, because I think [we were] really pointed out that we did something that was probably not proper in the in-camera meeting.

The recanting on the ALT was not a formal decision, it was a discussion we had and I was trying to echo it, but we couldn’t come to closure on it. So it’s not quite as bad as I may have implied. Tijani, please go ahead. And we cannot hear you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Hello.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, now we can hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. First of all, I disagree with one vote per region. We have an ALAC. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Can someone type a message to Tijani saying he's cutting out?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now? Alan, do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Tijani. I can hear you. Tijani –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. First of all, I disagree with one vote per region. It is the decision of ALAC, and it has 15 members. So the 15 members have to vote fist. Second, we go with the supermajority, yes, with [all vote] of ALAC as a whole. And we use [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost him again? Alright, let me put the phone down. I'm trying to answer his first question in the chat, and then we'll go ahead. Alright. Sébastien, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. I just want to I guess tell you [inaudible] same question [inaudible] But I wanted just to ask you one question about do we know who will be the chair of the NomCom, or if we don't know yet, when will we know that? I think it's an important element for a decision on one of the members. Thank you. And by the way, I am raising this question because you put something [which was quite] obscure for me, or maybe not so much, but in the document you sent about additional travelers, and it's why I asked you this question. Thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That was not related to NomCom at all. I know what you're referring to, and there was no implication of a reference to NomCom there in that particular issue. Sorry, I'm losing track here of where we are. Sorry. Sébastien, did you raise two issues, or just one?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I just raised one issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: With two [sub-bullets.] The only issue is, do we know who is the future chair? Sorry, incoming chair of the NomCom.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Yes, thank you. That was the first point.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's my only point.

ALAN GREENBERG: We know who is the chair elect. León is on the call. I do not believe the board has ratified him as the chair of the next NomCom. I have heard nothing to indicate he would not be ratified. But can León confirm that he has or has not been ratified yet?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Alan, my question is more the next chair elect more than the chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I'm talking about – oh, the next chair elect? I do not believe –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, because it's the one –

ALAN GREENBERG: Understood.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's the one who could have an effect. Thank you. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do not believe a next chair elect has been selected. I know applications have been received, but that is all I know. I'm pretty sure there has been no selection made at this point. Alright, since there are no more speakers at this point, I would like to put the question to the ALAC. And for those present, those in Adobe Connect, can you either put a green tick if you select option one, that is you're asking me to choose a methodology, or you want a vote, a [big poll?] So you can select 2A or 2B. And I ask people now to put ticks or crosses on whether you want option one to be selected.

We have one person who wants to get this over with quickly and not have to have another vote. One on each side. I am not going to vote in this, I'll tell you. Can staff please give me a tally or identify any ALAC members who have not voted?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan, we have currently one, two, three, four for option two. I'm sorry, I included [inaudible]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I wrote on the chat my choice, [I vote A.]

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, we are voting on one or two. If we're going to select A or B, it will be a real vote, not done on this call. So you are opting for two. So count Tijani as a red X then.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And Javier and Hadia.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, this is Seun, I'm for two as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, we're having two people talk at once. Seun, were you trying to speak?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Seun is on the queue. Yes, since I'm audio only. So for me it's two as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two for Seun. Can we have a tally, please?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may, it's ten to five. It's ten to five, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ten to five? Ten Xes?

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, but it's 10 Xes and five [are agreeing, green.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine. Thank you. Then we will go to a vote on whether to pick A or B in two, and you'll see that coming in the next couple of days. Thank you very much, item completed. Next item on the agenda is ALAC liaisons. ALAC liaisons are selected on a weekly basis. Sometimes it seems that way. On an annual basis. I sent out an e-mail last night. I hope most of you had a chance to read it. If everyone is comfortable, we can take a decision in this meeting. If you're not comfortable, I'll do a consensus call later. And I'll want to discuss a little bit first and then I'll ask where we are.

We have four liaisons to the ccNSO, the SSAC, the GNSO and the GAC. Two of them, Barrack and Andrei were just appointed –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I put my –

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if Tijani [inaudible] Okay, back to liaisons. We have four liaisons, two of which were just appointed a few months ago. I would like to presume we are not going to start looking for new replacements for Tijani and Barrack at this point. If anyone believes that they are doing such a bad job that that is an appropriate action, they have not



---

yet conveyed to me, and I would hope that they would do that pretty quickly. In the absence of hearing that –

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sorry, chair. Chair, you said Tijani and Barrack. You said Tijani and Barrack.

ALAN GREENBERG: I said Andrei and Barrack, I believe. Tijani was trying to –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, you did actually say Tijani, but it doesn't matter, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I said Tijani because Tijani was trying to speak at the time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: My apologies. The two liaisons. For ccNSO it's Barrack Otieno, and Andrei Kolesnikov for the SSAC. I do not believe – I have not been presented with any evidence that we want to get rid of them immediately. So I presume we are going to opt to reappoint those. If people disagree with me, then we need to hear that soon.

Our other two liaisons have served for approximately two years by the end of this AGM. Yrjö Lansipuro will have served for two and a third years, and Cheryl for two years. The question is, do we wish to open up nominations for one or both, or do we wish to reappoint? To the best of my knowledge, both of them are doing, I think, a good job. We have evidence on both counts in that despite our dissatisfaction with the EPDP, we do have two seats and two alternates. And there was a distinct possibility along the way that that might have gone another way.

One cannot attribute this wholly to Cheryl, but I have no doubt that her working in the background was at least part of the reason for that. And Cheryl has been operating in a rather difficult situation. The level of comradery between the ALAC liaison and the GNSO council is, to be blunt, not what it used to be. And I'm not talking about her personal relationships with the individuals, I'm talking about as an organization. And it's been a hard time, and I believe – and I don't believe it's due to the person, to be quite clear – changing to a different liaison at this point would be quite inappropriate. We need some level of stability.

In the case of the GAC, the recent appointment of the liaison from GAC, something that a year ago was unheard of – and it was suggested, and we were told there's no way it was going to happen. And it has now happened. And I think one can attribute that, at least partly – and I won't try to figure out what part – to Yrjö's work in cooperation with the GAC. So I would like to open a discussion right now on whether this is a reasonable way forward. And I'll open the floor. And I see Holly first.

---

---

HOLLY RAICHE: I would be in favor of retaining the current slate, but I'm very conscious of the ALAC review comments about leadership and about people staying in place for a long time. I think we really will have to, probably next year, seriously look at a change. Probably just not now. So I'd be in favor of retention, but a commitment to rethink these every year, seriously, and [change.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I've put myself in the queue, but we'll go in the queue first. Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I favor retention. They're great people. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Sorry, Heidi offline has told me John has put a motion in the chat, but I don't see a motion. Can someone please either point me to it or tell me what that motion is?

HOLLY RAICHE: Nominate all four for reelection – or for reappointment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That is not nomination, that is a reappointment without nomination.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. To reappoint all four. Thank you very much. I want to make a comment on Holly's statement saying the At-Large review said we're stagnant. The At-Large review, among other things, our analysis and the numbers we produced showed that we were not stagnant. Yes, we on occasion have people who are around for a long time. In most of those cases, we can demonstrably show that they have been doing good things.

I would not want to say a liaison, which I believe is a critical position, that we should discard them simply because they have overstayed. If they're doing a good job and are serving us well, I think we owe it to them and owe it to ourselves to consider whether we want to continue or not. That doesn't mean people stay there forever. But essentially saying we have term limits, be it two years or three years or whatever the number is, is something that I personally – and I'm not going to be in a position to do anything about it.

So I'm putting my steak in the ground and then leaving it there. I strongly do not believe that we should impose term limits if indeed we believe – and it requires really careful introspection of whether we are being well served or not in each capacity. So it shouldn't be an automatic renewal because they're our friends. On the other hand, I don't believe it should be an automatic ejection because they have been there more than a set number of years, two or three. I see Alberto Soto has a hand up.

ALBERTO SOTO: I fully understand your point. I believe that we do need experience, and the folk, our liaisons, do have experience. So my suggestion is to have someone else to start getting knowledge or absorbing their knowledge, because [that is the critique that we have to face.] So we need to have people to find the replacement for them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. That has been suggested, and that has been how we have worked in many cases. I'll point out however that if – as an example, if we say we're going to have someone – and we've used the term shadow – shadowing Cheryl over the next year, then that person has a reasonable expectation that they may be the GNSO liaison. So as soon as we appoint a shadow or a shadow's been found, we're essentially saying we are phasing out the old person. And that's reasonable when we've made a decision to do that. I don't believe it should be done automatically because a certain clock has ticked. That's my call. And again, I'm not going to be here. Any decision to appoint shadows or to find shadows will be done once I'm no longer chair.

I just think we need to be careful that we're not doing it just because time has passed but because we believe the person wants to step down or we need someone different in a role. And sometimes you do need someone different, but sometimes, stability has very strong merits. Alright. I have not heard any argument against reappointing at this point. Is there anyone who objects to taking a decision on this call as opposed to an offline consensus call? I'll give a moment. Sébastien, you

---

have your hand up. I'm not sure if you're objecting or you had your hand up before.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I just put my hand up because I think you need to read the – I'm sorry for that, I know it's complicated. [inaudible] in the chat because Tijani said that [inaudible] open a call for nominations, and you have to consider that as an input to you even if he didn't say that by speaking. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I'm not really good at reading the chat while I'm trying to chair the meeting. So I hope people are –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, [I was just telling you that –]

ALAN GREENBERG: Hoping people are calling my attention to it. No, that's fine. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [Alan, that's what I'm doing.]

ALAN GREENBERG: I appreciate it, Sébastien. No, I appreciate that. So Tijani in the call said he wishes – we should open nominations. On all four, or on two? Did

---

Tijani specify in the chat whether he wanted nominations on four or two? Can anyone find his message?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It just moved past [inaudible]

ABDELKRIM BOUKABOU: Sorry, can I be in the queue?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, you can be, but I'd like to have this question answered first. If someone could perhaps ask him in the chat or on Skype.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tijani said 2A.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, he said 2A on the previous question of NomCom. That was a different question.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, I'll ask him on Skype.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien said that –

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I have asked him on Skype, but he's not responded – he's going to respond in just a moment. No, only two, he's saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two. Okay, thank you. Is there anybody who agrees with Tijani that we should open nominations? The consensus rule is that 80% rules by consensus, and we try to make decisions by consensus. Are there any other people who support Tijani? And we're talking about ALAC members who support Tijani and believe that we should open nominations at this point.

HOLLY RAICHE: Maureen's hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, please go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. [This is probably not – sorry,] looking at your motion at your moment. But from my perspective as moving into the role for next year, I would truly love to have a stable team of liaisons who I've worked with over the last year and really respect the work that they've done within their specific constituency. And I'd like to maintain that relationship with them over the next year at least.

So I had actually mentioned in the chat that that would be my preference. But then I think [look – ] going forward, we should work on



---

a way in which we can look at a succession plan, and everyone's come up with the reasons why, and I think that they're important. But for a little bit of stability for me, that would be my preference, and that's to retain them in this particular instance. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you, Maureen. We're unfortunately running out of time in this meeting. We will do an online consensus call on this, and Tijani and others will have an opportunity to say they disagree with the consensus. And Maureen, I'll give you an opportunity to put your [inaudible] in as well. Abdelkrim I think wanted to say something. Is that a comment that's still relevant at this time?

ABDELKRIM BOUKABOU:

Sorry, I think I changed my mind. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. I appreciate anyone always not wanting to speak. Alright, so if staff can put an action item for me to initiate a consensus call. It will not happen in the next day or two just because I won't be able to. The next item – and we are, unfortunately, getting rather late, and if this call runs over another 25 minutes, I'll be happy to turn it over to someone else. The next item is León Sanchez who will talk to us about whatever León Sanchez wants to talk to us about. León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Alan. Can you hear me well?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you. So I'm going to be short as I'm mindful of the time. I just wanted to update you on the selection or the appointment of board liaisons to the EPDP, and that is going to be Chris Disspain and myself. We are going to be serving as liaisons from the board to the EPDP. By now, I'm aware that we have also designated the liaisons and the alternates for the EPDP, and I think it's needless to say that this is a very important process, and it's going to be a lot of work for everyone. And I do hope that we can actually pull this job together in the timeframe that we have [and are] required to do so. It is very important for the organization, and of course, for the community.

And I also wanted to encourage everyone to continue working on the subsequent procedures subgroup. I know that there have been some members who have been following this very closely. I know that Cheryl is a co-chair of the group. I know that Alan has been following closely this work too. But I think we need more people in. This is crucial for ICANN as an organization and for the community as we know that there were many things that could be improved in the first round.

So assuming there would be a second round, if at all, we should definitely have that second round correcting those or improving those areas in which we have actually detected that there is room for improvement. So I really encourage you to follow the work of this group, I encourage you to participate, and of course to help those who

have already been involved in the process to continue providing input from the ALAC. I think this is, of course, core to the interest of the end users, and as such, I think it's crucial for the At-Large community.

I also sent an e-mail to the list on a whitepaper on the DAAR initiative, and I see that a couple of At-Large members have replied to the e-mail. If you haven't seen that e-mail already, it's a whitepaper released by ICANN org on domain name system abuse initiatives. I don't recall the exact name for the [DAAR,] but in essence, ICANN org asked for the methodology of the DAAR to be reviewed, and two experts already provided feedback on this methodology.

And now ICANN org is asking for input from the different parts of the community, and I believe that the deadline for this is somewhere around August the 20th, something like that. So I really encourage you to also take a look at this, because this methodology deals with some issues that I also consider to be core to our mission in At-Large, which is of course those threats related to domain name abuse, like phishing, cybersecurity, etc. So I definitely encourage you to provide feedback on this methodology, have a look at the reviews that have been released by the experts, and try to make this something fruitful.

We will be having a board workshop in September. We are still shaping the agenda for that workshop. It will take place in Brussels, and I can tell you that we will continue to work on the fiscal year 19 goals and objectives for the board and we will continue to work on the strategic planning and the strategic plan from the board. You might remember that in Panama, we had some sessions identifying trends and trying to figure out how the community saw these trends, and of course to

---

---

gather feedback from the community as to some trends that org might have not started by the time we went to Panama.

So what we're doing on the board is also looking at these trends, adding our own trends and trying to come up with a strategic plan that will eventually of course released to the communities to provide us feedback as to whether you think that strategic plan is something feasible. Does it make sense to the community? And of course, to enrich that strategic plan when the time comes.

So at this point, I would like to pause and of course open the floor for any comments or questions you might have. And I think I'll turn the call back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Is there anyone who has – in the queue? We have no one at the moment. Then I thank León, and we'll move on. And the next item is the At-Large review, and I'll turn the floor over to either Maureen or Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm sure Maureen can take it. She's leading it up now with the implementation working group.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, we're just starting to move slowly towards getting some organization ready for our working group meeting. One of the things that I've done is just basically created a document that's

---

going to go – it's in the Google doc, so it's going to be – it's a Google doc. We'll ask – specifically ask for some ideas here on how we can actually go about creating a workplan [of] an actual implementation plan on how we're going to achieve the objectives that we set for ourselves, and how we're going to do it with regards to [using the working group.] Particularly within the Outreach and Engagement, [inaudible] popular policy areas that also [must be – will be – could be] covered within the CCWG.

But [inaudible] some ideas from both the ALAC and the regional leaders, and regional leaders talking to their members, just so we can come up with as many ideas as possible, put some into the Google doc, and we can actually [get] a working group team finally organized and meeting together, and we can go through those ideas and look at how we're actually going to do it.

So I'd really appreciate if we could have everyone have a look at that document. I've just put in some starter ideas based on – I talk about a communication pathway for example, you can see here in the first one. It is an organizational model that [I've actually been] looking at and working on at the moment, and I've passed it to a few people to get their comments. But once we can – I'll get it out so – I think at the same time to let people have a look at it and make comments on it as well. Okay, so that's where we are at the moment. Cheryl, do you have anything that you want to add on to this?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Maureen. I think the only thing is that at the moment, we've spoken to LACRALO, we've been invited to NARALO. We would be astonished – would we not, Maureen and Holly – if we didn't have the opportunity to speak to APRALO, but we offer ourselves to any RALO meeting that's left. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [So that's us, Alan.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I can't scroll this document so all I see is the first page. And I don't want to scroll it. Don't scroll it, please. I was going to say I can't see what's on the other pages, but I see on the bottom of page one something that I find just a little bit worrisome. And that is, in the implementation of the item on policy, the CPWG one, I would be careful not to enlarge the scope of what you're doing past what we said we would commit to.

There's always an opportunity for doing things better. And as an example, the item you have as number one in the column, of making sure our statements look different and are presented in a better standardized way, is a fine thing to do. And I'm not saying it's something we shouldn't do, but it's not related to what we committed to. What we committed to as you all recall, we said that their issue was not valid because we do differentiate and pick things carefully, but the website did not present that properly.

So I would just be careful to make sure that we fix the problems we say we're going to fix. And it's fine to do other improvements, but let's not add them to the mix of things that we're putting into the workplan that we call the At-Large improvements. So just a suggestion. And again, it's not a big item in this case, but I worry that if we're going to grow the list, there may be other places where we grow it in really substantive ways and we're increasing our work to be able to get this done and done quickly. So just a thought.

Anyone else? I see no other hands. Then I will presume everyone is happy with what you're doing, and we'll go on to the next agenda item, which is the EPDP. I do not believe this is a substantive item at this point. Last time I spoke to any group, I said the EPDP is convening next Tuesday. Now we don't know when it's convening because they've sent out another doodle with completely different times on it.

Apparently, whenever it was going to be convening did not meet someone's needs, and they were influential enough to have that meeting scrapped and a new doodle sent out. So I'm not quite sure what that means, but it will be meeting sometime the week after next, and I'm presuming this will be largely an organizational meeting. Cheryl said the 30th. Originally, it was scheduled for the 31st, now it is scheduled for the 31st, the 1st or the 2nd, the last time I saw a doodle.

I'm presuming it's going to be largely an organizational meeting and one trying to establish our work methodology, that is how often will we be meeting, will we be rotating schedules, and things like that. But that's a guess on my part. I strongly doubt we'll be dealing with anything substantive on the first meeting. And I see Olivier has his hand up.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And I just wanted to say a few words about the Consolidated Policy Working Group, because that's the group that will be supporting our representatives on the EPDP. So if you have an interest in this topic, the best way to get involved is, well, on the one hand to listen as an observer, if you have the time, to those EPDP calls. And I understand that there will be the ability to listen to some streaming without being in the Adobe Connect room, but at the same time, if you have even less time than this, then it's to participate in the Consolidated Policy Working Group. We will be having a call weekly and we will be speaking to our representative, getting their insight as to what's going on in that group and answering any of their questions that they might have regarding questions relating to our community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And to answer a question that other people have asked of how do alternates become less alternate and become active if a member cannot be available, they have now published a webform, and this webform has to be filled out to say when the member will not be available, from what date to what date. So it looks like it's not going to be nearly as flexible and capable of handling things that are not well-planned in advance. So hopefully, we will be able to plan our absences in advance in all cases, but otherwise, we may well be in a position that sometimes the seats are unfilled. Any other comments, questions?



---

Seeing none, then I will put an item under Any Other Business to go back to the discussion on liaisons. And given that we now have 15 minutes, perhaps we can complete this without having to resort to an online poll. And I would like to put the motion that John made, that is to reappoint all four liaisons for one more year, and bring it before the ALAC for a consensus call. Is there anyone who would like to abstain on the consensus call? Javier, are you on this particular subject or are you on some other subject?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Yes, I just want to second that motion to reappoint.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Motions do not need to be seconded in the ALAC, but thank you very much. Is there anyone who would like to abstain? And I'll do this as a formal vote to make it really clear. I hear no one saying they want to abstain and I see no hands. Is there anyone who wishes to vote no against the motion to not reappoint all four? Can I have confirmation from staff [as to] how many people are still on the call?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Just, Alan, it was a strange way to say it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Pardon me.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Alan, it was a strange way to say it from my point of view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Would you care to state it in a different way?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't want to put [inaudible] because – No, because you say no, no [inaudible] it may be a yes. And if you can say it again, it will be great. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will do it. The motion is to reappoint all four liaisons to the ccNSO, the GNSO, the GAC and the SSAC for one more year. Is there anyone who wishes to abstain from this vote? Hearing none, is there anyone who wishes to vote against the motion to reappoint for one more year? Tijani is putting an X. Does that mean you are wishing to vote against it? Tijani is talking but we cannot hear him. Perhaps chat would be useful.

Tijani, if you are wishing to vote against this, please put a message in the chat. Your microphone does not seem to be getting through. Can I see a show of hands? Let us try to do positive ticks at this point. I believe at this point we have all 15 members present on the call and only one person might be trying to say no. Can we have a show of ticks for those who agree that we should reappoint for one year?

Please keep your ticks up. Can I have a count of ticks, please? And identify if there are any ALAC members who have not indicated a preference.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan. I count 11 at this point. Evin, can you confirm that? And Alan, [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI: Another tick from the audio from Seun.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I see 12, and then plus 13 from Seun. We have 13.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tijani has voted against.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, we have one –

ALAN GREENBERG: So we have 12 for, one against. And who is unaccounted for? Andrei is one who is unaccounted for.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Should have got 13 with Seun.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, [but] Andrei seems not to have voted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, if there are 13 plus Andrei plus Tijani, do we have all 15 accounted for? If I can ask for confirmation from staff.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We have 13 yes, we have one no, and then we don't have a response from Andrei.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If I can ask staff to confirm with Andrei over the next day how he voted, and it will be recorded. But the motion has passed. So congratulations to all the liaisons, but we should record Andrei's vote for the record. And at this point, we have seven minutes left. Is there Any Other Business? Javier, please go ahead. Javier has put his hand down. We have no Any Other Business. Then I will call this meeting to an end. Thank you very much, and we'll see you online in the next week. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Bye.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you all.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Bye. Thank you.

---

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you all. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Do remember to disconnect your computers. I'm wishing everyone a good morning, a good afternoon and good evening. Thank you for joining today's call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]