

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team Teleconference held on Monday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> of July, 2018, at 18:00 UTC. On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Alfredo Calderon, Andrei Kalisnekov, Bastiaan Goslings, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Maureen Hilyard, Sebastian Bachollet, Yrjo Lansipuro. On the audio only, we have Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Seun Ojedeji, Barrack Otieno, and Bartlett Morgan.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Evin Erdogan, Gisella Gruber, Claudia Ruiz; and myself, Andrea Glandon, on call management. Yesim Nazlar is an apology for today.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep you phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Does anyone have any comments on the agenda? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we'll accept it as displayed and posted and go on to the first item of policy discussions. May I presume Evin will take this?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yes, thank you. So, looking at the agenda, the first three statements approved by the ALAC are executive summaries on the agenda, so I'll

---

*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.*

---

just move to the statements currently in process with the ones with upcoming deadlines first.

The first is ICANN seeking community feedback on supposed unified access model. There's not a firm deadline for this, but feedback is requested as soon as possible and we don't have current penholders for this one.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. Anyone have any comments on it. Anyone here involved in this? Not an insignificant issue. Apparently not. Next item then

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Okay. Next one does have a draft posted in the Wiki space for comments. It's not a formal ICANN public comment, but it's the IPC/BC accreditation and access model for non-public data. Version 1.7 was released today, so that's been posted on the Wiki and shared on the ALAC list.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I presume the situation is the same. Just to be clear, we'll come back at the end and see what we're going to do about assigning ones that don't currently have penholders. And if we can go back onto the next one, please.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Next one is the open data initiatives data sets and meta data. That's closing on the 27<sup>th</sup> of July. You are assigned as the penholder, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I'm not quite sure how we're going to do that. There have been a few little comments, but not an awful lot. I think we're going to have to just write a generic "we support this, but" or "and." Let's go ahead with it.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Next one, which has a draft posted, is by Maureen Hilyard is the draft proposal of the new fellowship program approach. That also closes on the 27<sup>th</sup> of July, so a call for comments has been sent out which will close on the 26<sup>th</sup> of July to give time to update the current draft posted there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, are you comfortable with where we are on that? I must say, I am either amazed, astounded, or something about how much effort has gone into this when we compare it to how much people put into real issues. But, nevertheless, Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Yeah. I think I'm pretty happy with the way things are going. People are still making comments, so I think there's actually ...

---

There's quite a few [inaudible] out there, so [inaudible] your input.  
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:            Alright. I see no hands. Next, please.

EVIN ERDOGDU:            Sure. Next also has a draft posted to the Wiki space. It's short-term opinions to address the timeline for specific reviews. That one closes a few days later on the 31<sup>st</sup> of July.

ALAN GREENBERG:            Alright. If I remember correctly, Sebastien posted something there. It didn't really read as a comment to me. It looked more like a dialogue of the thought process. I see Cheryl has put up a fair number of ... Has done either an edit of it or comment on it. I see Sebastien has his hand up. Please, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:       Hello, Alan. Thank you very much. I am working on a new version of the comment and I will try to post it by the end of my day tomorrow.

ALAN GREENBERG:            Thank you very much. Cheryl, given your comment, do you have anything to add?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. I'll have a look at the next run through that Sebastien prepared. He's been responsive, of course, to the other comments that came in earlier. But, one thing on that. I was a bit [inaudible] amused to see myself listed as a penholder. I think the record will show that I was a resource person, not a penholder, on that. We do almost need an extra column for people who actually work very closely on either the policy pieces or the [inaudible] staff offered – I struggled for the appropriate adjective then – piece of work. Sometimes, we would prefer to assist and act in an editorial role than we would a [inaudible] penholding. But, for the future, we might look at another call in for that type of thing, so it doesn't get confusing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The column actually is called "assignees" and I don't think there's any reason why we can't list the penholder first, perhaps with the title saying penholder and then others or whatever we want to do. I guess I would prefer to use vertical space than more horizontal space, but clearly that's a style matter and we can address it.

I thought at one point we did differentiate between penholders and those who are working with them. Maybe that got lost along the way with staff transitions. What was I going to say next?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just give me one moment, Sebastien, please.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, no problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is I posted something and it wasn't really in the form of a statement, but I tried to consolidate where we are. I'm not quite sure I did a good job, but you can look at that as you do your vision. Please go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you very much, Alan. I will look through all the comments, including yours and Cheryl's, of course, but I just wanted to – Cheryl, we were all four because we were named when we were [inaudible] ATRT-3. I guess Alan put our names. I just sometime after the Panama meeting left on a train between one city and another and I write something. But, I don't consider myself really as the penholder, but as I have done the first one, I will try to do the second one. [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. If my recollection is correct, I suggested the four of you should contribute comments, not necessarily be the penholder, but somehow you drifted up into the top box anyway. Perhaps my lack of communicating properly. Alright, so that one's in hand. Evin, back to you.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan, Sebastien, and Cheryl. The next comment that's currently being drafted is the long-term options to address the timeline of reviews and that closes on the same day, the 31<sup>st</sup> of July. The penholder assigned for this one is yourself, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me see what I did. I did post as a comment what I would recommend as the statement and we have had comments from John Lapriase, but no one else. So, I do ask people to, if they care about this one a lot, to look at what it is I've said and let me know if you support it or not. Not hearing any specific comments, I will post it as a first draft almost immediately. Next, Evin?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Alan. The next one also being drafted is the initial report on the new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process, overarching issues, and work tracks one through four. But, the close of this comment is much further out on the fifth of September. Jonathan Zuck has been kind of nominated as the penholder and is open to be penholder. But, there's no first draft yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm starting to get antsy on that and I actually just sent Jonathan and Olivier a note as co-chairs of the CPWG. We're a third of the way into the comment period and we haven't actually, as far as I know, assigned ... Either looked for volunteers or assigned things or started collecting comments on them. I'm just getting a little bit uneasy, but this

---

is a massive amount of work. The first cut at the comments has to be done pretty soon if we're going to try to put them all together and make it a cohesive reply. Olivier, you're on the call. Do you have any input as to how we're going to actually get this train moving? I think Olivier is on the call. I was told he is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier is going through security at the moment. Can I speak in five minutes, just after I've gone through security?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. We'll come back to you on this one. Evin, back to you. Next item.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Next one is there's a draft posted on the initial report on the protections for certain [inaudible] names in all gTLDs, the policy amendment processes. That closes on the 31<sup>st</sup> of July. The draft is posted by yourself, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I posted something. I believe there have been a few comments supporting it. I don't think there's been anything negative, so that one is proceeding along as it should at this point. Next item?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you. There are no statements that are stalled. The update on the agenda shows which statements were decided by the ALAC not to



---

submit comments on. There's one to be confirmed. A note was sent out on the independent review process implementation oversight team, IRP-IOT draft recommendations. That was suggested the ALAC would not comment upon. There have not been any volunteers to draft and there haven't been comments on the Wiki space, so this could probably be a [inaudible] statement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. Does anyone on this call believe this is something we need to put a cursory "yeah, we support it" in? Unless we believe there's going to be opposition, I would say this is not something we need to work on. I see Cheryl is typing. I'll wait. She agrees. Evin, can you send a note out to I guess the ALAC is sufficient, at this point, saying given that there's been no comments and no one has volunteered, there does not seem to be a reason that we need to draft anything? Just make it a statement. If anyone objects, we'll worry about that then.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sure. Thanks, Alan. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. So, we're left with the unified access method and the accreditation model. Two absolutely crucial issues that I know Heidi and, to some extent, one or two others – not Heidi, Holly, sorry – have been working on. But, I really feel this need to have more focus. When you look at all the intense interest in the EPDP, and this is an absolutely core part of that because what is in these two models or into these two

things are likely to feed heavily into the EPDP. If we are not commenting on this one – and I have some worry about how we’re going to contribute in the EPDP. I really suggest that we need to have a larger focus than just one person or two people looking at these. I don’t really have a strong suggestion as to how we make that happen, other than to put the responsibility into the CPWG to make sure that they look at it as well. I asked were there any thoughts, and I do note that the CPWG on subsequent procedures alone is going to have its hands full, never mind the EPDP or these two specific implementations. Anyone have any thoughts? It’s not an inconsequential area.

Sebastien says the EPDP team. Given what we are being told is likely the workload on that, I’m dubious that we’re going to have a significant drafting effort to respond to these two documents. To some extent, we’re supposed to be reacting, partially at least, to the input from the community. Would anyone like to speak on this? Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I gather you’re speaking about the EPDP and I heard also the word CPWG.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I was actually speaking on the unified access model and the accreditation model that there are open discussions on which are closely tied. They’re likely to feed into the EPDP, but they are looking for input at this point in their own right.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Alan. What I was going to ask is: is this still relevant? Bearing in mind that the EPDP is likely to revisit?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but I think the EPDP is likely to revisit it, but it's likely to use it as a base. So, as these things are still evolving, if we have them evolve in a way we like, then we're in a better position than not. So, yes, I believe they are still relevant.

In all honesty, I have no clue how this is going to unfold, but I suspect, given the amount of time the EPDP has to come up with a draft ... We're sending out the travel requests for Barcelona right now. That's how close we are and that's the timeframe in which the EPDP is supposed to have a draft. So, we're talking about really short times and I can't see how it's going to do everything from scratch. So, I think it's going to be in a mode of taking the kind of work we have done to date and then making modifications if necessary. If we support what's in those two models, then fine. If we don't, then I think we have to speak up.

In any case, I will put it on my list to contact Holly and see if she can get some more interest going and not just one or two people in doing this. Just give me a moment.

Olivier, you wanted to speak on – or at least I was asking you to speak on – how do we get things moving regarding the GNSO gTLD subsequent procedures comment.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, can you give me another two minutes, please? I'm in another situation at the moment. Sorry. Just two minutes. I'll be okay then. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Heidi has just reminded me that I skipped over the review of action items from the ALT meeting at the end of Panama, so why don't we display that and go back to that one while we're waiting for Olivier. Or someone can read them out if we can't display them.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, should we just begin while [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So, the first of several of them, Alan to send a message to the ALAC that the ALT recommends that ALAC delegate to the NomCom vote, there be five individual votes on the candidates [inaudible] by super majority of [inaudible]. I know that's being discussed.

ALAN GREENBERG: That didn't happen because there was dissention on the ALT about what we decided at the Panama meeting and it's on the agenda today again.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sure. Perfect. Thank you. Another one, Alan to invite the new GAC liaison to the ALAC GAC leadership meetings and also to suggest to the GAC chair the creation of a joint mailing list for the leadership of the two groups.

ALAN GREENBERG: I've done that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, you have?

ALAN GREENBERG: I just received a reply from Anna just before the meeting and haven't really read it. I have not received a reply from Manal yet. But, that's [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you. I did not see that. Once we do that, we'll have staff added to the mailing list.

ALAN GREENBERG: To the extent that she wants to be added to the mailing list. We're not trying to inundate her.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. Then, there are several related to Gisella and myself about 63. I'm not sure if that's relevant, those are relevant to discuss at this point. We do note them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Only mention them if there's something [inaudible] at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. Not for deciding on 63. Okay. Alan to write to ICANN about [APRALO] designation on the website. That's to do with ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'll raise that in our next ... I'm going to raise it just after this. I forgot we did not have an item for ALS membership, rather membership [inaudible] meeting. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Cheryl to follow-up on whether the EPDP [inaudible] will be allowed to join calls. I believe she's done that.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I believe the answer is yes, correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It depends on what you mean by yes, Alan. I've been very specific in what I've said and what I've said is [inaudible]. The ultimate [inaudible] will be fully equivalent to observers in the mail list, in as much as they

---

will, like any other observer, have read-only rights to e-mail. And to meetings, they are, like any other observer, able to follow the audio stream. They will not be given the Adobe Connect link for the “meeting” chit-chat per se. So, the alternates will have to back channel via Skype or something similar with the members in the primary meeting at the time. So, yes, they can certainly join the meetings, but it’s the other side of the cloth screen, as in some [inaudible] they will be tipped behind the screen, so to speak, so that they can’t speak.

ALAN GREENBERG:

So, that presumes that there will be a process and I’m not asking you what that process is, to put them onto the – allow them to contribute on a mailing list or join the Adobe Connect should they be actively replacing a member at the time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Exactly. And it’s going to have to be very agile staff. If someone breaks a leg as they’re on the way to dial into a meeting, then a call to the call managers in some way, shape, or form will have to ensure that they are allowed into the room, because it’s up to the call managers – and that’s ICANN staff – who is allowed into the primary Adobe Connect room. That’s the best we can do.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That presumes they have been given the magic passwords and URLs to get to it, but that’s an operational issue we’ll deal with as we need it.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Back to you, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Alan. Two more. AIs, and those are related to the At-Large review implementation work group regarding preliminary team and the mailing list. We will start on that this week in earnest, given the EPDP activities are now, [inaudible] now, behind us. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Now we're back to Olivier, if you've passed through whatever you were going through last time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, I managed to get through everything. If you could please remind what is it I needed to speak about.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're talking about how do we get the train of – and it is going to be a train with many, many cars – going on the ... Directing the public comment on gTLD subsequent procedures.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Right. I was more thinking about the train on what to do when it comes down to the EPDP. But, I think that the CPWG



---

coordinated policy working group is going to have to deal with all of these in parallel.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's correct.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

We had a meeting last week that decided that, due to the work load, we're going to actually start with a weekly call. We're going to have rotation on these, so it's not always the same people that are ending up at the more anti-social hours. And Gisella is currently working out a proper [inaudible]. We might have to readjust this when EPDP calls start up. But, because Jonathan and I are co-chairs on this, I think we can probably share the load. Obviously, both of us will follow both processes. When it comes down to making public comments, etc., I would imagine that we can do the same thing we did before for the accountability ... cross-community working group on accountability or even before that, the IANA stewardship transition one.

What would be interesting, or what would probably be helpful in those early days, is that this week we actually do some kind of a ... Not a website, effective, as a one-on-one on what we're talking about. Perhaps a one-on-one on the subsequent procedures, where the subsequent procedures group is now, and a one-on-one on what the EPDP is going to be talking about, including perhaps aspects of the temporary specification and also aspects of the responses that have been given so far by the European Commission.

So, we're at an early stage, if you want, of these things. We need to bring everyone up to scratch, because as you say, it's going to be a constant train of things coming our way, and I think that if anybody misses the train at the beginning, it's going to be very hard. So, we need to be really well [inaudible] on that. That means everyone with a recording, of course, so anybody who misses the call is able to actually go back to it and listen to it and get the explanations that they need.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. Let me be a little bit clearer on my concern. When I talk about trains, have any of you ever seen a freight train start up? The engine starts moving. It's a long time before that last car starts moving. We have to get all the cars moving. It's a complex process.

I'm not worried about getting everyone up to speed so they can understand what's going on. I'm worried about finding the penholders to draft these things. At this point, Cheryl and I are the only people who have been very active in the subsequent procedures PDP. Cheryl is a co-chair and cannot author our comments. And I'm going to be a little bit busy. So, we have to somehow start figuring out how to get people involved, get them up to speed, and up to speed enough that they can start actually drafting things.

Given that we're a third of the way into the call [inaudible] already, I'm starting to get worried. But, we're not going to fix the problem here but I think we have to go into a higher energy mode than we are at this point. It's not just keep getting people who want to listen up to speed.

---

It's actually getting workers and we're not in a good position to do that right now.

Olivier, unless you have anything else, we'll go onto the next item at this point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan. Thank you. So, what I would suggest then is to adjust the next call to be primarily speaking about this specific thing, about the sort of short-term things that we need to [inaudible] and we can always move by one week of the EPDP. I mean, at the moment, we're just dealing with priorities, effectively.

Now, in regards to penholders, I think it might be a good idea to identify a group of penholders so it doesn't just fall on one person who does the full load of the thing. If we can have a group of [inaudible] penholders that can look at each one of the statements and can [inaudible] this thing right, we're going to push for that, we're going to push for that, that might help. That's what I would suggest.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl has offered to assist, but we really need people. I'll remind you, we did hand things out to various people on one of the earlier internal comments on the PDP and some of the results were just a little bit more than embarrassing. We have to make sure that doesn't happen at this point. I'm not worried about the embarrassment. I'm worried about saying things that may push the PDP in directions that we do not want it to go.

---

Next item is update from liaisons. Do any liaisons have any ... Sorry, Cheryl, do you want to speak on the previous item?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. I feel I jumped the gun a little bit [inaudible] from the GNSO perspective [inaudible] very little [inaudible] EPDP and the words temporary specification. I think that's the GNSO liaison's [inaudible]. But, back to the subsequent procedures working group.

It might be of logistical assistance if [Javier] and I work with staff – [inaudible]. I know he is our person, co-chair, in the work track five effort. But, our leadership in all of the work tracks also works together and [Javier] has been particularly good at making sure he's across all of the issues and all of the calls that we have in terms of leadership [inaudible]. So, perhaps we could reach out to him and he and I could help if Olivier and Jonathan so desire, setting up some sort of real estate in the Wiki that may assist the process for the consolidated policy working group to work with. So, have a think about that, Olivier, while you're on the flight to Switzerland and get back to us. We've tried very hard in the [sub pro] work to put things out as separate annexes and in a way that could be broken up into tasks, but we may be able to facilitate that further by having that published material carved up in

---

some smart way, so that the working group can digest it and everyone can perhaps keep their finger on the pulse of comments a little bit easier. Think about that and get back to me. Thanks, Alan. That's two things.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. My recollection is there has already been a request to set up a multi-page Wiki site to address subsequent procedures. I remember a discussion of it. I'm not sure the actual request or decision how to do it was made, but there has been some discussion from Jonathan, I believe, on that.

We're now onto reports and liaisons. Do any liaisons have anything they would like to highlight?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Who is saying Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Olivier is saying Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, what liaison would you like to report on?

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just closing up on the previous thing that Cheryl has suggested.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I believe that, yes, staff are working currently to [inaudible] some web pages on this. It's in the process. We're building the basement of the house. That's it. It's getting there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll call upon Andrei, who I saw had his hand up and has since gone back on mute.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Hi, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Andrei first, then Yrjo, then Barrack.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Thank you, Alan. A short update. There were a couple of meetings during Panama and also there was a meeting on July 18<sup>th</sup> at the IETF. At the IETF, actually, the main topic was the KSK rollout. There's a lot of [inaudible], a lot of attention, a lot of work going on with this one, a lot of discussion, and also a lot of research in [inaudible].

Also, on EPDP, we touched the previous subjects, yes, volunteers [inaudible]. I don't know the names yet. Also, there was an agreement between SSAC and RSSAC about discussions forming about the KSK rollout. There was some movement on ICANN Org requests on refinement of the [inaudible] similarities. We had a meeting with ccNSO [inaudible] discussion.

What else? Pretty much the same subjects. Name collision, SSAC review work party, the meeting with MSSSI will be held in October. WHOIS rate limiting, documents updated. [inaudible] work party is now checking the places to outreach [inaudible] topics among the community with [inaudible] other things. Also, again, [inaudible] work party and their documents and research. So, that's [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Andrei. I sent out a pointer to SSAC 101, the paper on ...

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

Sorry. I forgot to say SSAC 101, the main one, it caused a lot of fire, a lot of discussion among the community with the recent news from icann.org and also about the [inaudible] recommendations. It's still going. I mean, it's a lot of discussion around it. SSAC 101 is setting a good pace, setting a good image, a good plan, nice picture, but the work and the reality might be different, of course, due to the legislation. [inaudible].

---

ALAN GREENBERG: It's clear we can't change the legislation unilaterally, but it's important for ICANN to understand the implications. I thought 101 did a good job of that. So, thank you. Next in line is Yrjo Lansipuro.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: First of all, Alan, thank you very much for inviting my counterpart, the GAC liaison, to ALAC and others to our meetings. I hope that they will be [inaudible] for the invitation from the GAC. [inaudible] on that will really make our relationship much more stronger.

Now, with Anna, we are planning to draft, make a first draft before Barcelona. For the follow-up, [inaudible] the ALAC, GAC statement about the informative, inclusive participation in ICANN [inaudible] stakeholders, basically saying that the board response so far has not been enough for GAC or ALAC either. But, I come back to that I hope in the next ALAC meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next we have Barrack.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you very much, Alan. For the ccNSO Council, we haven't had much activity during the month, but [inaudible] something that is of importance to the ALAC and that is that the ccNSO Council decided not to appoint members or alternates to the EPDP team and the Council's reasoning is that the policy remit of the ccNSO, as defined by ICANN bylaws, is limited and excludes a policy view of the ccNSO on WHOIS and TLD data collection.



---

The second issue that was highlighted by the chair is the requirement by ccNSO appointed members who represent the formal position of the ccNSO [inaudible] views or position which is [inaudible] or not in line with the ccNSO working procedures.

Finally, that [inaudible] will meet the required skill set on [inaudible] cannot make the required time commitment. That said, the council will still [inaudible] digital members and ccTLDs who share the experiences [inaudible] and were needed by the GNSO Council or the EPDP team.

I think that's what I just wanted to highlight in this meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Any comments or questions for any of the speakers? I see Cheryl has her hand up. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. In no rush to cover two things at once. I neglected to raise an issue, so if I could just pop my GNSO liaison hat back on. The material I just shared with the ALAC is not as yet, I believe, in an easily digestible form. But, let me tell you what I'm talking about and forewarn the [inaudible]. I had hoped to be able to share it with you in today's meeting and to get your guidance on how we might go forward with briefing both the ALAC and I suspect, but that really is up to you and the ALAC, the consolidated policy working party people, if not certainly the EPDP team that you've put together on what I found highly troubling attitude that became chillingly apparent during the last GNSO meeting.

---

I could not do justice. Listen to me as I'm saying this. This is me, the verbose one. I could not do justice to paraphrasing the [inaudible] and value that some [inaudible] specific part of the GNSO Council was expressing in their attitude to non-GNSO in general, but At-Large Advisory Committee in particular, engagement in EPDP in general, but specifically policy, in particular.

So, I took the liberty of asking staff and I believe they've got it off with the tech people to extract about ten minutes of "statements" by people in the last GNSO meeting. It's on the public record. But, I would very much like at a future point in time when that's available [inaudible] short version in [inaudible] recording to have the ALT and the ALAC look at how we can share this information so that the people that we're putting into the lion's den may know who their friends and who their frenemies actually are. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. I, of course, support that. May I suggest, when we put this together with the changes that were made from the interim suggestions, which were not commitments, I understand, and when we put together the fact that you are explicitly excluded from the GNSO strategy session last January, may I suggest it might be appropriate for I supported by you and perhaps the incoming chair to write a letter not to the GNSO, but to the GNSO chair, expressing concern over the tone and attitude? If you are agreed to that, then we need to talk about further how we go about that and what we say. But, I would suggest that might be a reasonable thing to do. Comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely. I've been just [inaudible]. That's certainly a longer view of issues, but as Olivier can attest and I know you remember well when you had the role, this is not a [inaudible] concern as the GNSO liaison were there and [inaudible] bylaw and therefore we will manage.

For our team members in policy development to know exactly what foundation it is that they're stepping on because I genuinely fear entrapment in some aspects of the EPDP work and certainly our fear for the future of the wider community and ALAC in particular in futures of policy development, recognizing that policy development and the way its done is also under review by the GNSO, except nobody has noticed it yet this year. I've been telling you about it, but that's an [inaudible] that there was ten minutes of very telling statements. They're on the public record. I'd just like to find a way with you all to share them appropriately. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understood. For those of you without the history that Cheryl has, let me note that, although things varied over the years that I was GNSO liaison, in general they were good and much of the time they were superb. I will share with you what I said. I'm not sure I already shared it or not. When I put in the ALAC suggestion to the Ethos Award Committee, I put in a personal statement at the end. I don't remember if I shared that or not. But, I pointed out just how welcome Stephane in particular had been and how he essentially had instructed me to act as a full GNSO member and not worry about the fact that I was only technically a liaison. So,

---

---

things have changed, which is why I'm suggesting that perhaps we want to bring it to the attention of a chair who doesn't have the history going that far back, either.

Anyway, I see we have a set of hands. Cheryl, I don't know if that's a new hand. If it is, speak. Otherwise, we have Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. I gather Cheryl has put her hand down. Thank you. I just wanted to say that I absolutely agree with what you mentioned regarding Stephane back in the day when he was GNSO Council chair. Hearing what Cheryl has said, and I'll of course listen to the dialogue or the discussion that took place on the record. But, I do have concerns and I do think that you are going on about it in a right way. If you don't think that perhaps an informal call to the current GNSO chair would be maybe something to start as a first step rather than going through the process of sending official letters and things.

I can certainly vouch that when I was liaison, I was considered as a full member of the team and there is no difference as to perhaps whether I was going to be in the room or outside the room. I do recall that I think it's the chair who decides at the end of the day, isn't it?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Not necessarily, and it depends to some extent on the chair.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, if there's a motion, that's a different thing. That makes it very unhealthy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Styles vary. I'll make ... No, I won't even make one more comment. I'll just leave it be. Alright, we'll look at that and decide how to go forward. Well, I will make the comment. Colleagues of the person ...

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible] in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we'll put you in the queue. Colleagues of the person that have been referred to, at least one of the people referred to by Cheryl, years and years ago made similar type comments about how the ALAC should not be involved. So, it's not quite new. It hasn't happened in the interim, perhaps, but in the GNSO Council meetings proper. But, it's not a brand new thing. Seun, please go ahead. Then, we have to move on. We're getting rather late.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Sorry. I just wanted to, the point what Olivier said in terms of a way forward. So, just [inaudible] the chair first before making things much more formal and official. I can imagine that for Cheryl to have said this, [inaudible] already, but for Cheryl to have said it, it means that it was significant, much more significant. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I had some insight into the current chair and I'm not sure that would be the way to go. It be if we were face-to-face. But, a teleconference I'm not sure would be productive that way. But, we need further discussion on it and that can't happen at the moment.

Next thing on the agenda is – and we are not very late, but a little bit late at this point – is on EPDP. I don't think there's an awful lot to say. The first meeting is going to be not this coming week but the week after. It is scheduled for the Tuesday, I believe, of the week after, on the 31<sup>st</sup> of July.

The team has not discussed anything at all. We are meeting later today just to try to get some feeling for how much time commitments we're going to be able to put into it. Are we going to have deliberate rotation or the main members will be there unless they can't? And just how we're going to work together as a team.

Being a team is not something we've done very well in the past. If you look at things like the IANA transition or the CCWG Accountability, or for that matter, the current auction proceeds, we appoint multiple people but they tend to work as independent agents, although occasionally they may talk to each other. I don't think that's going to work in this case. It certainly won't work with the concept of alternates and members. I think it's going to take some work to figure out just how the group actually acts as a team. I think that's going to be particularly important in meeting with things like the CPWG where it's clearly not going to be possible to get everyone to participate in every meeting. We

---

don't know what kind of rotation we're going to have with the EPDPs, but timing is going to be awkward at best and perhaps worse than awkward. So, it's going to take a fair amount of effort. But, I gather there's a CPWG meeting this Wednesday and I hope all of the team has been invited to join it. I'm not sure that's the case. But, I will be able to be on the call for the beginning part. I don't know how long the meeting is, but I can certainly be there for at least the first 45 minutes. I have an appointment on the hour at that point, so I can't stay past that. Any comments? Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I think it would be a good idea to have an action item to make sure that the representatives that have now been chosen to be on this EPDP are members of the CPWG mailing list and to obviously make sure that they will be on that call as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm sure they surely need to be on the mailing list. Whether we all need to be on a call at this point where there's not going to be a lot more information than we have today, I'm not sure that is absolutely critical, but clearly, if we can make it, we should. Any further comments?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, just to add. May I share?

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sure. Please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Just to ask about it would be good to have these meetings on the [inaudible] calendar [inaudible] and I can't find it there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The CPWG meeting, I don't know if it's been announced formally or not. I know I got a message that it was being held. Anyone on staff tell us what status we're on with regard to the calendar? It's not on my personal calendar which staff manages. Anybody? I don't know whose area that is right now.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I guess Olivier gave the answer at the beginning of his talk. He said that Gisella is working on trying to find the best way to have a rotation between the different regions [inaudible] time of the meeting and we don't have yet the meeting for this week. I know that it would be a short time to tell us, but I think that's where we are.

As I have the mic, I just wanted to say that we really think it is important to have the team at this meeting, CPWG, where we will talk about the EPDP because we think that it's the best place to be sure that everybody is on the same page, not just the team but all people who will be participating to this meeting and try to be aware of what is happening. I don't know if staff has better information about the timing of the next meeting, but [inaudible] the answer.



ALAN GREENBERG:

I have better information. The meeting is scheduled. It is not on the calendar yet. They are working on a rotation, but the meeting for Wednesday is scheduled at 16:00 UTC, at least that's what I was told, but it is not on the calendar yet, and if it is indeed scheduled, we really need to get an invitation, to show up on the calendar and get invitations out as soon as possible. Anything further on this? Cheryl says iCal is essential.

Next item on the agenda is At-Large review next steps. Maureen and Cheryl. The two sub-items are informing the RALOs and next steps. Would one of you like to speak? I see Cheryl has her hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Just a quick report, and of course [inaudible] during the briefing. We've had a couple of invitations from RALOs in terms of outreach to appraise them and their At-Large Structures and individual members at their monthly meetings. We've done LACRALO. We've I believe [inaudible] North America. Obviously, it would be astonishing if Maureen and I didn't get agenda time in an APRALO call. [inaudible]. But, obviously, we'd like to see other RALOs if they would like us to do a ... I think it takes about 20 minutes in all update. I've already got my PowerPoint in both English and Spanish and it's perfectly easy for me to make it into French or any other language as well, as long as you don't mind Google Translate. But, in the absence of having invitations to the RALOs to appraise them about the impending which should be ... I think the call should be coming out certainly by the end of the month, I'm

---

assuming, for creating the At-Large review implementation working group. In the absence of that, I would suggest that the PowerPoint presentations we've been using, Alan, including yours in whatever languages we have them in should be made more generally available and perhaps we could let the ALAC know that in their monthly call as well. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thanks, Cheryl. We've had some good introductory sessions with the RALOs [inaudible]. There's more to come, probably. What I've been doing is looking through the proposal document and starting to look at more [inaudible] oriented next steps kind of thing. I've got that [inaudible] through the implementation working group, so it was really good to have that reminder of who was actually in that group. Of course, the group and Cheryl and I will have a chat – an online chat – about some slight recommendations about how we go about looking through those items and actually putting, creating actions to go with those.

I'll be sending that out to you, Cheryl, today and then we'll get it out to the rest of the team for their input as well. I'd like to get a whole lot of ideas before we actually [inaudible] plan moving forward. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any further comments on the At-Large review? Seeing nothing, and we are back – not quite back on time. Next two items are just to call attention to the fact that we really have to proceed in some reasonably quick fashion with selection of liaisons for the coming year and

---

appointment to the ALT. It is conceivable that the results impact travel, so we probably will not get it done in time, but nevertheless, we really should – in time for the travel to go out, but we should look at the implications of it.

Just as a measure of what was done last year, what was on the screen right now and is linked in the agenda was the consensus call that went out last year. You will recall that we reappointed all four liaisons last year without any call for nominations, and that's within the right of the ALAC to do that. The grounds were that for both [Yrjo] and Cheryl, they had only been in their position for a year. [Yrjo] slightly longer than a year. For Maureen and Julie, we were planning that they were going to be stepping down during the year once we had a selection of replacement.

So, the question this year is are we going to want to keep all four in place? I think it would be rather unusual if we took the SSAC and ccNSO liaisons who have just been appointed during the year and did not give them the benefit of the doubt. Whether we do the same with the GNSO and GAC liaisons is a matter officially up to the ALAC. I'd like to take this opportunity to ask this group are you willing to recommend that all four liaisons be reappointed for another year?

As I said, we have two of them who have just been reappointed. I think it would be rather unusual. And in the case of the GAC and the GNSO, we have two liaisons who, as far as I understand, are working very well and we definitely have a continuity issue that things are somewhat uneasy with the GNSO, as Cheryl has just mentioned, and are working very well with the GAC and I think in both cases it is not the time to put

a new person in there, so my personal recommendation is that we recommend to the ALAC that we reappoint all the four liaisons at this point. I'd like to know if there's any input now or if you'd like to go into private session to discuss it. Bartlett, please go ahead. By the way, I will certainly take private input if you don't feel comfortable with discussing it at this point or don't even want to raise the issue or we could go into a private session at the end of this meeting, if necessary. On the other hand, if you're happy to go forward, then perhaps you'd want to say so, Bartlett, go ahead.

BARTLETT MORGAN:

Yeah. I have no problem expressing my view right now. I'm in support of the idea of continuity. The concern that I have is medium-term continuity beyond the person in the position, which is to say the idea of persons sort of shadowing the incumbent. I think once we take that on as a [inaudible] consideration, I have no problem with the person continuing the role, so that when they do have to [inaudible], we don't have the same issue again. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I would suspect ... We can certainly ask for people who are interested in perhaps stepping up in the future. I would think given the current relationship with the GNSO, their acceptance of someone shadowing and being included in meetings and mailing lists is not something that would be well-received and I can't say whether the GAC would have an interest in that or not. It's certainly something we could

---

---

discuss, but that is something that goes slightly beyond this current reappointment phase. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks. I just wanted to point out to Bartlett continuity and history. That is exactly how when I served as the ccNSO liaison I certainly took on a couple of understudies. They were not, in fact, invited to be part of ccNSO Council calls, but they were invited to immerse themselves in some policy development work that was going on at the time. From that, also a couple I had understudying me, information came back very quickly which one would be most acceptable and most welcome to be put forward to follow me. So, there's a number of ways of skinning the cat and making sure we do have good succession planning, Bartlett. I certainly support that. Certainly, it has worked in the past. I'm sure there are ways we can work our way around it, but it is essential. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anybody else? I haven't heard anyone request a private session and I haven't heard anyone else make any comments. I will welcome private comments and get confirmation or support if indeed we want to make such a recommendation to the ALAC.

The next item is the selection of the ALT. This is, from my position, is purely up to Maureen to decide on the timing of that. We can show the example of the message that went out last time, but it's a pretty standard message with the appropriate parts changed to handle the different situation. It's linked to the agenda. So, that one is purely up to

---

Maureen, and presumably, she will speak at one point and decide when she wants to do this call. Based on what I currently understand of the schedule from Panama, it does not impact travel issues. Any further comments? That's just a head's up. I don't think we have any discussion at this point.

Alright, we'll go onto the next item and that is NomCom appointments. To recount the history, we had a face-to-face in-camera meeting in Panama, a meeting of the ALAC, 15 ALAC members because there had been some suggestions that one or more of the candidates who were named by the RALOs were not people that we ... Were people that the ALAC might not want to endorse. We made a tentative decision at that meeting which was almost immediately reversed by a number of e-mail messages. The issue was considered by ...

So, what we decided was clearly off the table. The ALT considered the issue in this meeting at the end of the meeting and we were going to make a recommendation to the ALAC, but in an e-mail discussion among the ALT, several ALT members decided they weren't comfortable with the way we went forward, the way we had suggested going forward. So, it never got to the ALAC.

I am putting a proposal on the table right now, which is somewhat related to what the ALT suggested, but based on more recent discussions, I think there is some chance that this is something that will be supported by the ALT.

What I would like to know at this point is: is this supported by all ALT members? If so, I will present it as such. If it is not supported, then I will

---

ask whoever does not support it to either give an opinion why or contact me privately so that we can get this issue resolved. We can't put it off forever. I am suggesting that we hold votes for each of the five candidates, that we do them separately in five different votes, that it requires a super majority to agree that this is someone that we want representing the ALAC on the NomCom. There will not be an abstention because the recommendation ... Certainly, a discussion in the ALT was that this should be a recommendation of the ALAC and [inaudible] super majority of the ALAC. So, we need to count every vote, essentially.

Obviously, people have the opinion of not voting should they choose not to. And if any candidate is rejected, the ALAC will have to decide then how to proceed, but we're not casting anything in stone at this point. It may well be that all candidates are ratified. Does anyone have any comments? And I'm specifically looking for input from the regional ALT members. You can reserve comment now and contact me privately or you can say what you want to say now as you wish.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'd like to put my hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you, Alan. I just want to get [inaudible]. There is not going to be abstention on the ballot, but if somebody decides not to vote,

---

how do you determine a super majority? Do you [inaudible] those that did not vote as part of the super majority [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG:

What I believe we are looking for – and that was the substance of the ALT discussion – is we are looking for a super majority of the ALAC supporting, ratifying the appointment. So, there's no question that this is supported by the ALAC by more than just the majority. If we do not count people who don't vote at all, then we could end up with a very small number of people voting and that would not indicate strong support in the ALAC.

So, what we're looking for, since there have been questions raised about some of the candidates, what we are looking for is a strong message that the ALAC supports that candidate if they are going to be put on the NomCom. Sebastien, no I don't want you to – one moment. Sebastien asked do we leave the room. No, I do not believe we need to leave the room. I don't think we're talking about individual candidates. We're talking about whether this process is something the ALT wants to recommend to the ALAC or not and I don't believe there is any reason that it has to be done in camera. Maybe I'm missing some subtle point, however.

Sebastien, I am aware of the other candidate, which perhaps is on your mind, but I don't think that is an issue now since we are not talking about what happens if the recommended candidate is not selected. Yes, Bartlett, please go ahead.



---

BARTLETT MORGAN: I just wanted to clarify going off of that exchange regarding Seun. If, during the vote, someone doesn't vote in [inaudible] candidate, they don't say yes or no, their abstention will be counted as a no, just to clarify.

ALAN GREENBERG: Effectively, yes. It's the same methodology we use in selecting the ALAC chair, for instance. The ALAC chair must be elected by a – in that case, it's a majority, I believe, maybe a super majority – of the ALAC. So, in other words, you do not want to select a chair that is not supported actively by a large part of the community. We're looking for a similar support level here.

SEUN OJEDEJI: May I?

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. My [inaudible] is if somebody decides not to select this or not, it means that it doesn't mind how it goes. I don't think that [inaudible] or no should then effectively mean a no. I think we should [inaudible] myself just like I would suggest [inaudible] in a position of [inaudible]. I think that the vote counts should be based on those that actually voted. [inaudible] election. There is no reason why my vote would be counted.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Seun, I'll point out on an e-mail you did accept this, but I'm happy to have you change your mind at this point. But, what you're saying is that two-thirds of the ALAC decide to say they don't care or don't want to vote, then five people will make the decision.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, that's what I'm ...

ALAN GREENBERG: I want to be clear. That is something you would be happy with. Is that correct?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, so long as we can get a majority from the five. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else have any input? At this point, we have one person saying they are not happy with it. Does anyone else have any input? Alright. I will proceed under advisement. You'll hear more from me on this.

Preparation for ICANN 63. The travel issues, the travel requests are going out shortly. Maureen still needs to decide exactly how the Friday sessions are going to be held, but I hope we're getting close to that. The additional travelers are going to be selected tomorrow by the RALO chairs and hopefully that will happen and will happen quickly. At this point, we have no problem who have withdrawn from travel and need

---

to be reallocated. It's likely to happen, as it almost always does, but at this point, we have no one in that situation. Gisella or Heidi, do you have anything else to add at this point?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Just a comment that if we could move forward with identifying the prep team for ICANN 63, if we have not already done so. We do have a lot of information already coming out of Panama on what kind of meetings you'd like to hold or how to set that up. So, if we could move forward with that prep team, we could go ahead and actually get a pretty good schedule together, I believe.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

The process we have used in the past is a small number of people that had been fingered by me or Heidi, and in this case, clearly Maureen has no choice but to participate since she's going to be in the hot seat next time.

Over and above that, we have asked for volunteers. Last time we got a reasonably large number of volunteers, most of whom never participated again. I would suggest that don't volunteer unless you're really willing to be active. It goes pretty slow at the beginning and very fast at the end. So, we are looking for people who want to participate in the detailed scheduling of the meeting selection of what we do, and to some extent, when we do it, and to a large extent, once we know what the cross-community and high-interest sessions are whether we schedule against them or not. Lots of detail about when do we schedule working groups and all that kind of stuff. We're looking for input from

---

anyone who would like to participate, but don't volunteer unless you're really willing to participate. Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks for that, Alan. Just wondering if you're okay with having Gisella look through all of the action items that we have for 63 and start putting together some schedule so we can ...

ALAN GREENBERG: I never object to people doing work. Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Perfect, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: By the way, the invitation for people to participate goes wider than just the ALAC, than just the ALT, so we should send out an invitation to the public ALAC list. That's an action item on this. Anyone else have any further comments?

Then the next item is the review of the ALAC meeting. Well, it's not a review. The question is does anyone have any items you would like to see on the ALAC agenda meeting, the ALAC meeting agenda? The meeting is tomorrow. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, that was an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Shame, shame. Anyone else have any thoughts? Then the agenda will be [inaudible]. Yes, Seun, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. I just wanted to point a question to Cheryl. The outreach and engagement was [inaudible] to the GNSO [inaudible] them to share that at the ALAC meeting tomorrow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can't answer that. My lead would be from the [inaudible]. I'm happy to appraise the ALAC as far as I have already, perhaps with a little less color in my language, as I did with you all today. But, I am expecting permission. Heidi has been working with me while this meeting is going on to get me permission to look at the [inaudible] that our tech team has managed to extract from the several hours of GNSO meetings. If that's in good order and says the right part, [inaudible] the right part, then I can probably make that link available off the agenda. But, I also want to make sure that we don't blow this out of proportion. This needs to be forewarning and forearming of our workers as much as it does briefing the ALAC. I am wanting to be cautious and take the guidance from the [inaudible] as to exactly how you want me to proceed. Not in the position to actually answer you clearly just at this stage, Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, two questions. You said you need permission to see the excerpts. I thought these were public documents.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, they are. [inaudible]. Yes, Alan, [inaudible] sure that you have to give the ALAC a link to some ten minutes of audio by hell or high water tomorrow should you wish to. [inaudible] answered.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest that, at this point, there's not a lot to be gained by doing that at the ALAC meeting. I think we need to put together a plan going forward before we do that. If there is very strong support for doing it, then Cheryl certainly can do it in her liaison intervention, but I would suggest there's not a lot to be gained at this point by doing that right now. I'm certainly willing to take direction from the rest of the ALT if you think there is – or any of the advisors who think there is a strong reason for doing so. Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Thanks, Cheryl, for your [inaudible]. Also, to say that I'm inclined to also agree with you, Alan, on this. I think we should [inaudible] actually [inaudible] ALAC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Alan. I wanted to make sure everyone is aware of a request from the RALOs that is on the agenda for tomorrow under

---

---

decision. It is regarding the CROP Review Team. Did you want to expand on that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

You were at the meeting, too. Why don't you expand on it?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. The RALOs joined their call, the regional leadership call, last week unanimously agreed to request to the ALAC to close the CROP Review Team. It was their view that they thought that the RALOs, the co-leads, should have that position. Or the RALOs should have the ability to develop their own CROP requests. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

There will be opportunity to talk about it tomorrow. If anyone wants to say anything right now, they certainly can. The CROP Review Team has been a thorn in our side, to some extent, because there have been eight different interpretations of what it should be doing by different people on the CROP Review Team and people watching it from the RALOs, number one. And number two, there has been an increasing belief that the RALOs aren't mature enough to do this properly, they can live or die by their own decisions and don't need someone looking over their shoulder to make them for them. I'm summarizing a very long discussion.

Nothing else, then the last item is any other business. We have three minutes left in the agenda. Does anyone have any other business to

---

raise? There was nothing raised initially. I'll give people a moment to raise their hand or call out.

Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, then I will call the July meeting of the ALAC to an end. We'll see you online. Bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks, everyone.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Goodbye, everyone.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**