| YESIM NAZLAR: | Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Monthly Call taking place on Tuesday, the 28th of August, 2018, at 4:00 UTC. |

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Monthly Call taking place on Tuesday, the 28th of August, 2018, at 4:00 UTC.

On the call today, from the ALAC members, we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Andrei Kolesnikov, Sebastien Bachollet, Alberto Soto, Ricardo Holmquist, and Alan Greenberg present.

From the liaison side, we have Andri Kolesnikov, Barrack Otieno, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Yrjo Lansipuro present.

Looking at the phone bridge, we have Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Daniel Nangkaha, Sarah Kiden, Lianna Galstyan, Glenn McKnight, Eve Edelson, Leon Sanchez, Satish Babu, Justine Chew, Judith Hellerstein, Amrita Choudhury.

On the Spanish channel, we have Harold Acros.

On the French channel, we have Gabriel Bombambo.

Currently no one listed on the Russian channel.

We have received apologies from Adrian Schmidt, Kaili Kan, Holly Raiche, Joanna Kulesza, Shreedeep Rayamajhi, Javier Rua-Jovet, Vanda Scartezini, Bartlett Morgan, and Maritza Aguero.

From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Evin Erdogdu, Siranaush Vardanyan; and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

Our French interpreters for today's call are Claire and Isabelle. Our Spanish interpreters are Claudia and Marina. Our Russian interpreters are Ekaterina and Galina.

I'll be managing today's call.

Before we start, I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And please don't forget to mute your lines when not speaking. And a kind reminder for those who are on the phone bridge to use *6 to mute and *7 to unmute your lines, please. I'm now leaving the floor back to you, Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Is there anyone who has any other business to add or any other comments on the agenda? I see no hands, no voices. Then we will accept the agenda as presented and go on to the first item which is the outstanding action items. I see we have zero minutes identified which I presume means there are no action items that need the action or the attention of the ALAC and we'll go on to ALAC policy development activities. Evin, I presume, will be taking us through that.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. As you can see, the past month, four statements were ratified by the ALAC. They are summarized on the agenda. The four are initial reports on the protections for certain Red Cross names in all

gTLDs, a short-term as well as long-term option to adjust the timeline of reviews, and open data initiatives data sets and meta data.

There are currently five comments including one unofficial comment being in process with the ALAC. The first two are listed on the agenda on last week's CCWG call were given an internal deadline since there's no official deadline of this Friday, 31st of August. The first one is the unified access model. Greg Shatan has volunteered as penholder for this comment and has posted some comments, but not yet a draft. Still working with him on that.

The second one also on this Friday is the IPC/BC accreditation and access model. Jonathan Zuck has volunteered to collect comments for this and make a final draft. There is already a draft from a prior version in that work space.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Thank you very much. The next item on that list is recommendations [inaudible] IDN variant top-level domains. Satish had volunteered for that. Satish, I see you're on the call. Are you in a position to tell us where we are with that, and if indeed we should be submitting a comment? Is Satish with us and can he speak? I see he's on Adobe Connect.

YESIM NAZLAR: Satish, are you able to speak? I don't see you currently on the phone bridge.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. We'll go past that. I'll note the date, the deadline, is the 3rd of September on that. The next item on our list – we'll come back if we can – is ICANN strategic, African strategic plan 2016-2020. We have Fatimata as the penholder of record on this. Is there anyone from AFRALO on the call who can tell us what the status is? The deadline is the 10th of September. Tijani, go ahead. You're a little bit low, so despite what Yesim said, maybe you have to speak up at this point.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. It was the Adobe Connect. This is the bridge. So, Fatimata is the official penholder and I don't know if she started the drafting. She did not tell us. But I think she is working on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Is this going to undergo a discussion—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, one moment, though. One moment. Is this going to undergo a discussion within AFRALO before going to the ALAC?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think so.

ALAN GREENBERG: I heard an answer from Tijani, but I couldn't make it out. I think we have Barrack also speaking. I think.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I said I think so. The comment to be discussed inside AFRALO before going to ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. Was that Barrack or was that somebody else who was trying to speak?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is [inaudible] for the record.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Please go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. Fatimata has been working on the strategy and [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. Next item on the list is the report on gTLD subsequent procedures. That one I know has a lot of work going on on it. The comment has been extended until almost the end of September. So, at this point, we have a fair amount of leeway and work is progressing. Is there anyone who would like to comment on where we

are on the call? Otherwise, we'll presume it's simply working. I know there's been weekly meetings on the CPWG. Anyone have any comment they would like to make on this? Seeing no hands, I will assume nothing and go on to the next one.

Independent review process oversight team. Draft recommendations. I think we decided not to do anything. Sorry, I'm reading the wrong column. We decided not to do anything on that one, barring anyone's strong desire to. The same with co-op and the same with the root zone label generation rules. We have a new one on study on technical use of root zone label generation rules. My inclination on that one is to say I don't think we need to intervene on that unless someone else has any strong feelings otherwise. Not hearing anything here, and presuming we haven't had any responses to an e-mail query, then we will not do anything on that one.

The last one is modification of domains protected marks list service. This is a service of Donuts on their domains to protect certain second-level registrations from happening, except under certain rules. I personally see no reason that we need to intervene on that one. Does anyone else have any input or thoughts on it? No voices, no hands. Then we have decided not to do anything on that one, either. I think that brings us to the end of the policy discussion. Is that right, Evin? Are there any other outstanding questions we need to address, assuming we still don't have Satish to talk about variance.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Alan. You're correct. I note that Satish just wrote in the chat the draft has been posted and the final version will be ready by the deadline. So, I'll work with him on submitting final comments [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. If a draft has been posted, then I would strongly suggest other people – and I know there are quite a few people within At-Large and the ALAC who have an interest in IDN variance. It turns out it's a relatively important issue to those scripts that have multiple versions. For those not familiar with the concept of variant, it's very similar to upper and lower case in Latin characters and we take that for granted that we can use them interchangeably, but that's not the case with other types of variants. Satish, please go ahead. If you're speaking, we cannot hear you. Now you're muted, apparently. Sorry, still a problem. We'll go on to the next item on our agenda then and that is the current status of ALS and individual member applications. Evin?

EVIN ERDODGDU: Thank you, Alan. As you can see from the snapshot on the agenda, the total number now is 230 ALSes. The most recent ALS that was accredited by the ALAC is the Cyber Peace Foundation based in India [AFRALO] region. There's currently one ALS [Nujohn] – I believe I'm pronouncing that correctly – from NARALO which is undergoing due diligence for [decertification] by NARALO. We have three – I'm sorry.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible] the floor. Thank you.

EVIN ERDODGU: … [Avoiding] regional advice. One from LACRALO and one from [AFRALO]. We are currently undergoing due diligence for several, quite a few, applications. Three of them we're awaiting applicant feedback on and a couple of others we're still processing the form.

Then I can go on to individuals. We have two applications from individuals, one from NARALO and one from AFRALO. There's an increase in the number of individuals which is largely due to EURALO Individual Users Association [inaudible]. They ratified their individuals separately, so we're now in communication as to when they're updating their numbers.

Then, a LACRALO orientation call will be scheduled. That's all for ALSes and individuals. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll note EURALO still has almost twice as many as any other region. Other regions have to get going. Next item on our agenda – oh, before we go on, I'll note that in the chat Sebastien had noted … He was suggesting that we have a discussion of ATLAS3 and I put that under any other business.

Next items is reports from any liaisons or anyone else who believes that their monthly written reports need to be supplemented by something verbal on this call. Anyone like to speak? This is liaisons, chairs, work group chairs. Andrei, please go ahead. I cannot hear you, Andrei.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: This is Andrei.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, we can now hear you. You're very feint, though.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Okay. Is it better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is much better. Thank you.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Okay. It will be a short update from SSAC. The comments from SSAC was published which is SSAC 102. It's regarding the KSK rollover plan. It's available online. I believe I posted it to the ALAC distribution list. It was not an easy one, but it's now published. There are basically … The majority of the [inaudible] members said that there is nothing new which will prevent us from the rollover plan, but we do have [inaudible]. It's not in the technical area. It's in perception of the risks regarding the KSK rollover. You can basically see the details about this online. This was all because there was no special meeting of SSAC, but there was a big discussion regarding this statement. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Andrei. Yes, that was interesting. It's rare that one sees published dissenting opinions in SSAC. As I think I said on one of the mailing lists, I think that's rather healthy in an issue where there is controversy that we're not afraid to air the controversy and say that this is not unanimous.

I would like to call on Yrjo and then we'll have Satish going back to the variants discussion because I understand he's now on the phone bridge. So, Yrjo, please go ahead, first, though.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Good morning, good evening. There will be, again, a joint ALAC-GAC meeting in Barcelona. We have a few obvious agenda items [inaudible], especially geographic names. But anything else, any ideas, for the agenda items would be welcome. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Yrjo. Question. Are we going to give [Anna], our new liaison, an opportunity to introduce yourself to the ALAC? Do you see any need for any other explicit interactions? I think, if nothing else, we do want to make sure everyone knows what she looks like and can easily approach her. So, we should probably try to find an opening during one of our general sessions, either on Sunday or on Tuesday, to do that. I'll ask staff to make sure that it's listed as one of the things we want to cover in our agenda and work with you to reach out to Anna and see if we can arrange a time that meets her needs as well as ours.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Yes, Alan. This is a good idea. I agree, absolutely. By the way, with Anna, we are actually trying to put together a certain draft for the follow-up statement of our joint ALAC-GAC statement in Abu Dhabi concerning the informed and meaningful participation in ICANN issues. I hope that we can [inaudible] draft in Barcelona. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That would be good. Again, if you think that's likely to happen, please let Gisella and Heidi know, so that we can try to allow some time for it. If we can go to Satish now and then we'll go to Barrack after Satish. If Satish is on the line, let's go back to the discussion on the public comment on variance.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Alan. I hope you can hear me now.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you very well.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much. So, the point that I wanted to raise on the [inaudible] that was posted is that there appears to be two schools of thought on IDN variant TLDs. [inaudible] from the end user perspective seems to want it because it is pretty much [inaudible] of what it [inaudible] everyday language that some [inaudible], like you said, [inaudible] however is somewhat [inaudible] of the challenges that this poses. Therefore, they would like to [inaudible] on this.

So, I reached out to [inaudible] and some others have posted comments. Currently, we have to decide on how we should [inaudible] and I was actually thinking of raising this in the next CCWG meeting for their perspective on this. [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I found what you said just slightly amusing because I believe the first time I was involved in a variant discussion where we were told we had to go slow because it's difficult was probably about seven years ago. So, we are indeed doing our best to go slow. The question is can we ever make any headway? But, yes, I think talking to the ccNSO is a good idea. Can you give us a little slight insight into what our comment will say? Are we coming out for or against?

SATISH BABU: The draft comment [are saying for], so [inaudible] written in the draft. We are actually [inaudible] TLDs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good.

SATISH BABU: So, [inaudible] down is what actually are we trying to come up with [inaudible] and then CCWG as well and becoming to be ready for publication maybe [inaudible] in the group, ALAC [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. I'll make a note that I'll make sure to look at it then, put my comments on.

SATISH BABU: Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Barrack, please go ahead.

ANNOUNCER: Your air time is exhausted and your call has been terminated.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope that wasn't my call that's been terminated.

BARRACK OTIENO: I hope it's not mine, too. Hello? Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead.

BARRACK OTIENO: Yes. This is Barrack from the ccNSO Council. Not much has been going on, presumably because of the holiday seasons, although there's been a call for expression of interest for the IANA Naming Function Review Team for which there has been no response for the better part of this

month. Basically, the council is looking for – have an opportunity to appoint three ccNSO members to the IFRT and one ccNSO, ccTLD representative who is at least associated with a ccTLD registry. I think I will forward this to the ALAC list, so that if any of us miss the criteria, they may be able to respond because it's been about four weeks in the council now and no one has yet to come forth. I think that's all that I wanted to raise.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Bararck. Again, I find lots amusing in this call. When we did the IANA transition, there was so much distrust of ICANN that we put all of these checks and balances in and made sure that we reviewed things on a regular basis. Operationally, things are going well enough that I don't think anyone has a lot of interest in putting up a year of their life into that. So, we'll see how that turns out.

Is there anyone else who has a report of any sort they would like to talk about right now? Then we will go on to the next item.

The next item is the NomCom delegate from knowledge. As public knowledge, the ALAC voted on the recommendations from the RALOs. Four of the five candidates put forward by the RALOs were accepted and has been named as delegates. And in the case of Europe, the delegate was not accepted. We are in the process of trying to identify how we can proceed at this point. There has been a discussion within the ALT which didn't yield anything. I have asked Olivier to identify any other possible candidates he believes could be good candidates and I

don't believe we have anyone at this point to present to the ALAC in a public discussion. But hopefully we will resolve this moderately quickly.

We have been asked by the NomCom staff to name our delegate by the end of this month. Originally, they wanted the person named by the 24th and that deadline has already passed.

I believe, but we need to verify, that this is being done purely to ensure that we can make travel arrangements for the person to be at the Barcelona meeting in time for the NomCom to be convened. At this point, there is no chair of the upcoming NomCom and I don't believe we have a firm date when the chair will be named by the board. As a result, we are in a wait and see position.

Clearly, if we name someone who does not have visa problems, we can name someone quite late, but I'm not sure that we want to take that risk. So, we will be working on it but there is nothing to formally discuss at this point. I do see a hand from Tijani, though.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I hope you hear me well.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. EURALO presented two candidates with a preference to the first one. We voted on the first one and it failed. So, why we

didn't go to the second choice? If EURALO advising us not to take it, they change their mind, why the second appointed person wasn't considered? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The simple answer is the candidates that were at the EURALO ballot, like candidates for any ballot for this kind of position, are simply nominated. There is no implication that the RALO supports that candidate other than the number of votes that they attract if it's a selection where there is competition.

Presuming that other candidate was put forward by EURALO I believe is not necessarily appropriate. That doesn't say that candidate is not a valid potential delegate for the NomCom but I don't think we can presume it is given that they were the second choice, that they were a choice endorsed by the RALO explicitly as a second choice. So, I don't think we can make that decision off the top. As I said, I have asked the chair of EURALO to provide some input into this process. I don't believe we want to do that in an open meeting right now, but we will have to proceed on this relatively quickly. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I hope you can hear me okay. Yeah, it's a [inaudible] that the other candidate was [inaudible] and it happens that she is my wife. I don't think that the discussion, what you say, are really the full truth. Tijani, no. EURALO put one name to ALAC. Nothing else. EURALO had a choice of two candidates and they decided to put one. I think it's a question we may need to think about in the future how to

solve that [inaudible] and I guess if we ask the RALO to rank that candidate and not just to decide one amongst two or three [inaudible].

The second point is that if one of the two candidates would have been the only one, it would have been selected by [inaudible]. No votes will have been done in EURALO, I guess. It's why I am a little bit concerned about not the result, not what we are doing, but the way we present the situation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. I would certainly advise, going forward, that we have a substantive discussion thinking about how we do this process in the future. Clearly, that was indicated. I'll just add one more comment, and Tijani, I gather you would like to speak again and I'll let you. I'll point out that in one of the other races there was also a contention and the second candidate got less than 10% of the number of votes of the first candidate and that presumably included the candidate's own vote. Being the second does not necessarily mean you are endorsed by the RALO. It just means you got less votes and we don't look at the numbers. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you very much. So, if it is like that, I think the phase of the RALO to select or to vote on the candidate [inaudible]. Let's make people be nominated to the ALAC and the ALAC will choose among people who are nominated because this is exactly what happened for EURALO. You said that they didn't endorse two candidates with a [inaudible]. You said that they had two candidates and they [passed]

them, so it is useless. The phase of the RALO is useless in this case. They have to select their candidate, and if they have two candidates and they have preference to one, they have to pass [inaudible] to the first. This is the [inaudible] of the RALO choosing or pre-selecting their delegate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I really don't think we can, at this point, have a substantive discussion on how we should do it in the future and that is what you're saying right now. I will point out, in the past, we have had a RALO saying, "We think all of our candidates are good. You, ALAC, choose." And we did. That's not what EURALO said this time and I think we're just honoring that. At this point, it is an ALAC decision, and as ALAC chair, I have asked for input from the RALO chair and I'm still waiting for that.

I would like to go ahead to the next item, please, and that is a discussion with Leon Sanchez who is on our call. I will turn the floor over to Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Hello, Alan. Hello, everyone. Can you hear me well?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not very well. We can hear you. If you can be a little bit louder, that would be good.

LEON SANCHEZ: Let's see. Is that better?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, thank you. So, thank you for having me again. I would like to just comment a couple of things that happened, going on in regard to the board activity.

The first one is that, as you might already now, the board passed a resolution in which it affirmed the temporary specification for registration data or the temp spec that's currently being discussed in the EPDP Working Group. So, that's that. It will be valid for another 90 days and the board will continue to affirm that temporary specification until the end of the work of the EPDP Working Group and not more than one year from the first date in which it came into effect which is May 25th if I'm not mistaken. So, [inaudible] until May 25, 2019. That has to go through the process every 90 days.

Another thing that is coming up in the board activities is the workshop we will be holding in Brussels. During this workshop, of course, as usual, we will have community meetings. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee will be meeting. The Board Governance Committee will be meeting. Maybe that meeting of the BGC will have a more clear picture about the NomCom chair designation. I am not involved in the process, so I can't really comment about it, but I'm pretty sure that the BGC will be talking about this topic in their meeting in Brussels.

We will have one public meeting during our Brussels workshop. I don't remember exactly when it is happening. I think it's happening on September 16th. I will confirm the time as we get closer. I believe somewhere around 10:00 UTC or 11:00 UTC, something close to that. But I will confirm. I will send you an e-mail letting you know the exact time, and of course the details if you want to attend this public meeting.

I am also aware that the At-Large Implementation Review is beginning to do good progress. I know that Cheryl and Maureen will update us on that, on the status of the implementation soon. I'm definitely looking forward to hearing the progress they made and I encourage every one of us to help as much as we can this implementation, so that we can close this issue as soon as possible.

In other topics, I know that there has been some nervousness in the At-Large community in regards to the planning and budgeting for ATLAS3. I can assure you that the board is aware of this nervousness. We will be also speaking about this in Brussels. If you ask me my sense about the feeling both in the board and the organization, it's that there is general support for ATLAS3. And as you might remember, there was a commitment by the board to secure funding for ATLAS3 and not have the ALAC and the At-Large community. So, this is [inaudible] every year so this could be added into the multi-year budget. I know that the board is aware of this and the board is supportive of this issue. The organization seems to be also supporting of this. In my mind, I think that the only thing that's missing is that we need to find a way of how to actually assign budget from one fiscal year to another fiscal year, but I'm pretty sure that we'll find a way. Hopefully, we'll have [inaudible] in supporting the At-Large community to hold its global ATLAS meeting.

I would like, of course, to thank you again for having me here and to open the floor for questions, if you have any. Alan, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have a question. A comment and then a question. I normally meet with the CEO just before, sometime before, each ICANN meeting and I had my conversation with Goran a week or so ago, along with Maureen this time. Our main subject that we raised was ATLAS. I was encouraged that he did have a plan on how to move forward and I'm optimistic, as is Leon, that this will move forward.

However, the plan that the board approved had two components. One is ATLAS every five years and that happens to be where we are in the timeline right now. The plan also called for a GA, one GA per region in the interim periods between the ATLASes. I see that as more of a threat right now than funding for ATLAS because recently, certainly in the last five years, we have been funding the GAs out of the AC/SO special budget requests, and with the size of the AC/SO budget requests this year anyway gone down to half of what it was previously and no indication, no secret messages, coming back saying, "Don't worry. It will go back up again," I'm really worried about whether we're going to be able to continue the GAs, even if we have an ATLAS.

So, that's not today's problem. It won't come up for another year or so, but it's something to think about as we go forward both in terms of how we want to organize our things, and from a board perspective, how are we going to actually pull this off if we want to continue. I'm not sure

Leon has an answer, but I just wanted to raise that other aspect of the ATLAS.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. I don't have an answer to that, Alan. You're right on that. What I would encourage us to do and advise us to do is to not wait any longer to raise this issue and to try and speak with the board members that form the finance committee so that we can advance this topic to them and begin speaking about how we can address this issue, so that we don't fall into limbo of [bureaucracy]. Let's definitely have a follow-up on this maybe in a call or e-mail thread. But let's definitely address it before it gets to us and it's too late to address it. Thanks for raising it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Maybe we want to wait until we get this money first before asking for the next slice.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes. But, however, let's keep an eye on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that. That doesn't stop us from having private conversations. Is there anyone else? Leon asked for 15 minutes and we still have lots of time. Surely, someone has a question they want to ask Leon. Heidi says, "Is there an AI on this?" No, there is not an AI on this at this point.

LEON SANCHEZ: May I suggest, Alan, that we do state an AI for this and we plan a follow-up call or e-mail trying to find a way to address this, at least the mechanics, and who would be [actively] participating in whatever group we form?

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we will follow your sage advice. We now have an AI.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anybody else? This is going to be a quick meeting. Thank you, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. Thanks, everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're welcome to say, of course, but no obligation if you actually want to sleep.

LEON SANCHEZ: I will stay up as everyone else.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Next item on our agenda is At-Large review implementation. Maureen and Cheryl are the speakers. I don't know who is going to speak first or at all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we'll do at all, but seeing as my voice has gotten [inaudible] and my teeth are aching, I might let Maureen take the lead and I'll jump in as required. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: But, before you do, I'm told you're in the process of retiring from your day job and you'll have more time for At-Large and ICANN. Congratulations. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. It's really good to be able to follow Leon on this one, because as many of you know, it was actually the 23rd of June that the board actioned the three resolutions in regards to the implementation proposal that ALAC sent to them earlier on in the year.

But one of the first conditions that the board set was that we actually establish the At-Large review implementation working group, which we have done. I'd like to thank the volunteers for putting their names down for that role and that includes the formal voting members from each RALO and also the RALO members who have actually put their names down to attend as participants in our calls. Everyone is welcome, so we really need to get everyone's ideas and participation. As Leon has said, if we're all working together on this, we can get it done really quickly.

We're also inviting observers and [inaudible] members from other constituencies who are interested in what we're doing and we're expecting to have a few of those as well. So, that's [cool].

Another expectation that the board has requested is a detailed explanation. This is [where the work is going to be]. A detailed explanation of how we aim to address each of the 16 items in our implementation proposal. These are going to be prepared for an At-Large implementation plan template which we have to send to the board as soon as possible, but it has to be before the end of December and I'm hoping it will be done a lot sooner than the end of the December, so that we can get started on that.

As well as the details of the implementation, the board expecting that perhaps there may be some budget implications. So, some of these implementation activities. And these have to be detailed as well. So, that's something else that we really need, so that when we've got our teams working on them, and these are some of the key things that we're going to be looking at during the At-Large review implementation working group every week, meeting tomorrow. We'll be looking into [inaudible] how we approach each of these items, so that we can start actually detailing the implementation aspects of each item.

Now, for this to take a [inaudible], I think I may have mentioned earlier, but I have a Google doc online and it's really just an opportunity for people to put in any ideas because once we've assigned people or groups to those particular activities, they'll be able to consider all the ideas that come in and put together something which I hope will be innovative because we don't want to be doing the same things that we

did before and probably weren't as successful and [inaudible] as being note successful. But they have to be sustainable and measurable. So, we do need to be looking at how we can still show the strategy we chose is going to be effective, but also that it's going to be effective over the long term. So, attendance at the At-Large meetings are going to be very important.

Also, as part of this, Cheryl and I came to the meeting this morning in the [inaudible] group was the multi-stakeholder strategy and strategic initiative group. They [inaudible] reporting tools, and unlike [inaudible] Cheryl talk about those because she has been waiting for those for a long time. Yet, what they gave us was probably not something that we're too unfamiliar with, but there's a lot of pen-pushing that's going to be done. Cheryl, I'll leave that to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Maureen. Yes, despite the fact that Heidi asked several weeks ago formally what sort of project management and reporting tools would be best to be using, we have a meeting this morning, the day before, [inaudible] meeting of the review working group where we established who knew what about which. Since then, we've also been given a cleaned [inaudible] data template that will make our reporting useful and quite reasonable. So, we'll show the working group that tomorrow. With the type of [inaudible] and timeline and milestone management Maureen had envisaged, we will rely on Heidi and [inaudible] staff to work out of, believe it or not, Excel. Don't even start me on this, people, however. To meet our meager needs. Whilst they have other templates in Word, again our terrific staff are going to be

putting things into Wiki form so that we don't have people like myself, for example, who don't use [inaudible] Microsoft products disadvantaged in terms of collaboration, etc.

So, none of what we will be using is going to be a problem. Some of what we will be expected to produce is very much in line with what we've done in the past. We do have to tie up, as a matter of formality, things that we have said in our accepted implementation, overarching implementation, project plan we put in where we said these are the things we are not going to do. The board accepted that plan, so we do have to finalize that.

But to that end, that needs to be tied up. That needs to be tied up, so to speak, that we have agreed to not continue in those lines. That tidies up some of Alan's concerns about [reigniting] things that we put to bed. We will put them to bed finally, fear not.

The other thing I think is probably worthwhile mentioning is that the [inaudible] me to contribute in my other meeting, within my other ear at this time. I do apologize. I'm getting very annoyed with what's going on here. Maureen, just let me go on mute. I apologize.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, do you want me to take over or do we go to the queue?

MAUREEN HILYARD: [inaudible] she supposedly [inaudible] everything anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: What I was going to say is really addressed largely at Cheryl, so Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. You said that the members of this working group are appointed by ALAC. I am a member of ALAC. I didn't remember that I participated in this operation. I may have missed it. If I missed it, please tell me when and how ALAC appointed those people and what are the criteria to choose them. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Are you talking about the membership of the review group, Tijani? If you are, I think those members were actually chosen by the RALOs themselves.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am a member of AFRALO. I don't remember that we appointed anyone to this group. I am not contesting the names. I said I didn't remember that AFRALO selected anyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know we selected the leadership of the group and I do not recall what we did further than that. So, let's make sure we have everything in order.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can assure you, if you would like me to remind you, the Panama meeting, during the meeting, we collected a number of names. The names that were not [inaudible] such as LACRALO and APRALO and I believe one of the NARALO ones, we then reached out in the monthly meetings to encourage people to join and that's what you see.

If any of you, as a region, have a problem with who has stepped up from your region, then deal with it at the regional level and I'm sure we can fiddle around, shove them out of the way and put someone else you prefer in. But these are the names that were collected as part of the record at the Panama meeting. It is the meeting of those records that we built our list from and we backfilled it by doing our outreach in most of the regions.

I note, however, AFRALO did not invite Maureen and Alan and I to present in the last month, so we didn't have the opportunity to have this conversation with them and invite their members [inaudible] participants. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Tijani, do you have a follow-up?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I have a follow-up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Normally, it would be a call for volunteers or a call for people to the RALOs or any kind of call, so that everyone will be aware of this. We are not aware. I am not aware. I am a member of AFRALO. I am a member of ALAC and I am not aware of the call for people to this working group. I was the one that asked that we form this working group in Panama and [you] said, no, we have something to do before and we have to do it. It is very quick and we have to do it immediately. [inaudible]. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. We will check our records. If we have to do anything to put things in proper order, we will do that. Let's not spend a lot of time here.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Please, please, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will take it under advisement with staff, Cheryl, and Maureen. If you can have an action item for us to look into it, please. Thank you. Cheryl, did you want to continue with what you were talking about originally before? I had my hand up to ask a question, but I will wait for you to finish if, indeed, you have more to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My comment was going to be something you touched and already mentioned my name. It's just to remind the overall group there were 16 issues raised in the original report. There were 16 major recommendations raised. We don't need to talk about those recommendations because they are not part of the overall discussion.

In relation to the issues, we said what we thought was the issue we needed to address and gave a very brief overview. We also gave a timeline. The timeline is instructive to look at, because of the 16 issues, three of them, the timeline was not applicable because the issue really did not exist as a problem and those, as Cheryl says, we need to put to bed and make sure they're tied up with a nice bow.

Five of them had an ongoing timeline because they were not necessarily major new initiatives but we would keep on working. Those, there may actually be stuff to do because, if nothing else, we may look for funding to be able to allow us to do it better.

Just remember as we go forward, we have three different categories of work to do. Two of them, hopefully, will be a lot easier than the others which really brings us down to eight which we have an awful lot of work to do in going forward. I think segregating them and narrowing it down I think will help us get a focus on the work and allow to start on a reasonable rate. Thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Let's make it really clear. The only reason that we had anything [inaudible] member is to make sure that, should we [inaudible] everything or anything, if Maureen does wish to make a consensus call, would involve some sort of tallying up of opinion, so that we have a balanced regional representation and balance between the ALAC and the RALOs. So, fear not. There will be no issue at all about what are the [inaudible] Maureen's status as chair and mine as a mere advisor to do with the positioning on any of these lists.

What Maureen and I have encourage in the outreach we've done with the regional meetings we've been invited to over the last four to six weeks is also encourage others to put themselves forward as participants and we'd very much like to see that coming out of the other RALOs. We did get some out of APRALO but we'd love to see more participants from other RALOs as well. So, please, do spread the word there.

The only other thing worth reporting or raising the attention for the ALAC in today's call, Alan, and I assume that you'll be asking Maureen to make regular reporting at the monthly meetings, but as you know, we put certain timelines or priorities associated with a number of – actually, all of – what we thought was implementable in response to issues raised in our document that was accepted by the board.

The board resolution makes very clear that how we are to prioritize our work in the At-Large review implementation working group is to be one that deals with the simplest and least costly things first. So, they will be the first [inaudible] priority. The more complex and the more costly ones later and any budget requirements, regardless of complexity, of

what we're going to implement needs to go along within the normal ICANN budget cycle. So, ALAC does need to realize that there will be a re-jigging in order and in order priority as we do our work. That's it from me. Thanks, Alan. I don't know if Maureen has other things that I've missed. I'm still distracted by this other meeting in my ear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Maureen, anything to add?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No. Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. In terms of Maureen reporting, there has been an item on our ALAC and ALT agendas for as long back as I can remember on the At-Large review and I presume that is something that will continue going forward. So, if staff feels they need an action item to remind them to keep it on every agenda in case either I when I'm chair or Maureen when Maureen is chair doesn't remember, we can certainly add an action item. I don't believe it's really necessary, but I'll leave that up to staff. Any further comments, questions on At-Large review? Then we will go on to the next item which is the … What is the next item?

The next item is two very short items on what were Affirmation of Commitments, now a bylaw required specific reviews. The first one on the RDS WHOIS Review that I'm chairing. I'd just like to report that, as of this morning, the review team has approved the entire draft report and

all of our, I believe, 23 recommendations and that will be published …
Barring catastrophe, that will be published I believe next Monday.

I would like to take the opportunity, if the ALAC would like, to hold a
webinar on it. It's not necessary, but if there's any interest in finding out
what's going on on that, I would be pleased to do it and I'm sure I could
find a few more team members to participate in it. We will not have a
lot … There will be an engagement session at Barcelona. I don't know
what it's going to be scheduled against, so it may either be convenient
for everyone or completely impossible, but I'm delighted to do one for
At-Large if we would like a webinar either before the meeting or after
the meeting. I'm not going to ask for input right now, but I see Tijani has
his hand up, so we'll go to the queue before I go on to the next item.
Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, I believe that we need a webinar about
it. And if you don't mind, it should be as soon as possible, not before –
perhaps before Barcelona. But if not possible, just after that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: There will be a public webinar that we are scheduling. Our target was
middle of September. So, we will be doing a general one, and optimally,
if we can wait until we have that one created, then we can use the same
basic presentation, perhaps with some variation, for At-Large. Certainly,
that would minimize the amount of effort to not have to do one before.
But that same one could be done after Barcelona if we start running out
of time. There are other issues, such as the EPDP or issues related to the

new gTLD program that might be more urgent that we want to spend our time on. So, I'm just making it known that we could do it if we want and whenever we can find the time.

The second issue related to review teams is the SSR, the Security Stability & Resiliency Review Team. As you may remember, the board took rather radical action last November, October-November, at the Abu Dhabi meeting, to halt the review because they had a number of significant concerns with how the review was proceeding. It took a very long time. The responsibility of restarting it was given to the chairs of the ACs/SOs. That was a rather unusual thing. Chairs of ACs/SOs have no responsibilities in their own right normally, but this one was presented to them – or to us, since I'm one of the chairs.

It took a very long time for us to get a handle on what was going on and then propose a way forward. We did propose that a facilitator be put on board to start the review team over again, so [inaudible] was chosen and has been working with the review team for the last two months or so in some preparatory work, not substantive, and they met face-to-face in Washington, DC, last week. I haven't had a report from it back, so I really don't know how it went.

I think, among other things, we want to try to meet with our members of the review team to get an update of what's going on. If they're going to be in Barcelona – and I think they will be, but I'm not sure yet – we'll arrange probably a very short meeting, just so, again, so people see each other, know what they look like, and establish a dialogue so that we can try to keep a little bit better up-to-date on this. We were rather negligent in that we named two people to that review team and then

basically left them on their own. So, they didn't come back to us. We didn't go back to them. That's obviously not a good way to do things.

We have now added a third person to the group and I think we want to manage this, since they are representatives, we want to manage this going forward a little bit better than we, or for that matter, any of the ACs/SOs did last time. So, just a head's up that we will be talking about this more, probably having a webinar at some point and probably meeting these people face to face, assuming they are in Barcelona. Any questions? Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. My mic was not coming on audio dial-out, so I had to use this. This is a question to the previous agenda item. The At-Large Review Team, have they been close? I just wanted to confirm [inaudible] at the last ICANN meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Our proposal was accepted by the board. It is now up to us to do the implementation and we are expected to interact more regularly with regular reports as we go forward. So, they have accepted our proposal.

Now we have to implement it and that's where we are today. The implementation—

SEUN OJEDEJI: That [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And the group that Maureen is leading, the ARIWG, the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group or whatever it stands for, is the group that has that responsibility. Currently delegated by the current ALAC and presumably will be re-ratified as necessary by the new ALAC when it comes in.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible] the one that created, developed the document [inaudible]. That is my question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. Can you say that again, Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: The team, the review team that actually developed the report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, sorry. You were asking was the working party closed, the group that was responsible for the actual carrying out of the review.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do not believe we have formally taken action to disband it. That's probably something we should do the formality of, but we have not and thank you for the reminder. I'll ask staff to put an action item for us to go through that process. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The difference between our situation and some of the implementation working methodologies in a post-organizational review that has happened not only to us in the past, but to other parts of ICANN, is that in the board resolutions, the board specifically resolved for the new review implementation working group to be created, that by, their own definition, makes it a [fresh] group. And as we said in Panama, we would encourage those with experience out of the review working party to move themselves across and be engaged in that working group. We still have many [inaudible].

                           But, of course, the ALAC [inaudible] suggest should dissolve the review working party. Its work is over and thankfully was accepted by the board in totality. We had the specific board resolution that required the new working group, as it is named, the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group, to be created and that's what's happened. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I will point out that it was always our intent to go to a new group to do the implementation and not the working party that oversaw the processing of the review. Due to the board resolution, we are blessed with an unpronounceable name, but other than that, I know it was always the intent. Anyone else have any comments on the current subject, the two specific reviews that I discussed? If not, we'll go on to the next agenda item. I see no hands, hear no voices.

The next agenda item is the EPDP. I seem to be the speaker on that. I don't believe Hadia is on this call, or at least she wasn't initially. Has she joined us?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Alan. No, she's not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And we don't have Holly but we do have Seun who is one of the alternates. The report, however, is relatively short. We have spent the first several weeks going over the temporary specification essentially paragraph by paragraph because the first deliverable out of the charter was a triage report, which was – the intent was to identify which sections of the temporary spec does no one have a problem with, and at which point, they are simply will be built into the new policy and we don't have to discuss them further. That was a little bit idealistic perhaps in that there are basically no sections that no one has a problem with. Everyone has a problem with something.

So, it was an interesting process nevertheless, and in many cases, in identifying that there were problems with sections, the various groups have identified what they believe was the problem, sometimes even provided language that would be used to flesh out the replacement should there be a replacement for that section. It's been an interesting exercise.

We're now going to get into the next part of the process of starting to actually look at substance and decide how to move forward and we're starting on some of the hopefully easier sections – sections related to the UDRP and the URS, the two intellectual property mechanisms, to address intellectual property issues in the use of domain names and move forward from that.

It's going to be a difficult job in that there are very strong opinions in some cases, and in other cases, we're going to have a real challenge. The At-Large, for instance, and the security professionals and the GAC I believe are going to have a challenge in that currently the privacy commissioners are saying this isn't ICANN's business at all, that we shouldn't be worried about access for various other people. Yet, in our minds, in many cases, other people will not be able to get access unless we do certain preparatory work.

So building the legal justification for some of this is going to be an interesting challenge that, at this point, we don't believe ICANN has done that properly, and going forward it's going to be a good challenge.

That being said, I would like to have everyone look at – well, I'll back out. The working group did ask for whether any groups have any input

they would like to toss in at the very beginning, before we deal with the substantive details. The NCSG has put in a significantly detailed document and the SSAC has contributed the SSAC 101 report which was the report they issued a few weeks ago specifically on the temporary specification.

I would like to suggest that the ALAC endorse SSAC 101 and essentially put our stake in the ground saying that we believe these issues are important. They're not necessarily the only issues that we believe in.

To this end, I would like to have staff redistribute SSAC 101 and I will be starting almost immediately a discussion for a couple of days on this. It will also be brought up at CPWG meeting on Wednesday. I'm assuming there is a CPWG meeting. Then do a consensus call on the ALAC presenting this as an ALAC position. You'll be seeing that over the next couple of days. It's a very short and very readable report and I suggest, if you haven't done so already, take a look at it. But I would strongly support that I think we will further our aims by putting our stake in the ground and saying these issues are important. Any comments or questions? That's all I really have to say. I don't know if Seun has anything to add at this point.

Things are chugging along. We're not at 30 hours yet, but it is starting to take a significant amount of work because the amount of homework essentially that's being assigned for each meeting is non-trivial. No comments, questions? Then, we have Seun. Go ahead, please, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I think the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can hear you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I think [inaudible] mentioned by Alan. The [inaudible] is not very as much substantive as the one we looked into alternate [inaudible] in face-to-face which should be an issue for NCSG, as an example. I don't know whether Alan wants to talk about that in details.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. I can. It's an issue that's over at this point and I wasn't going to mention it, but I can. As you probably all know, there are members and alternates for this group. The alternates have strict rules that they cannot participate in the same Adobe Connect room. They are not allowed to post to the mailing list. Essentially, if an alternate has to step in, then staff has to take action to put them in and take out the other person. It's not a very trusting environment. Nevertheless, that is what was set up.

There is going to be a face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles at the end of September and there was a substantive discussion on the rules of engagement for that meeting and the recommendation made by the chair was that alternates be allowed to be in the room. They obviously could not speak, but they were allowed to be in the room during the meetings. Everyone went along with that with no complaints with the exception of NCSG, several members of NCSG – not all of them – who objected strenuously to the alternates being allowed to be in the room.

They went so far as to say if the alternates are even in the city and you go out to dinner with them, you would work with them and collude with them and the alternates would be doing things in the hallways.

A number of other members, including one of the GAC members, made a very strong statement saying the EPDP rules explicitly call for the members to represent their constituencies. They are not there acting on their own behalf and the concept if you're not allowed to talk to your alternates who are supposed to be able to step in at a moment's notice and are also representing your constituency that you're not even allowed to talk to them in the hallways or not allowed to chat with them on Skype or something like that was objected to very strenuously.

The chair made his ruling saying we are going ahead with the proposed rules. There were, again, several comments saying it's going to completely disrupt the meeting and they have not been acted on.

I will point out that Milton Mueller made a moderately strong statement saying he doesn't object to alternates being in the room. There were another of his colleagues on the NCSG side who objected very strenuously. I think I wasted enough time on that subject as I want to. I did make an intervention on it saying if we can't decide on who can be in the room, how are we ever going to decide on the substance? Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. Actually, the [inaudible] hand please. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If staff can drop his hand, thank you. If there are no other questions, then our next item is At-Large at ICANN 63. I'll turn it over to I believe Gisella or Heidi. I'm not sure whom. We have two Gisellas present with us on Adobe Connect, so I'm presuming one of them will take on this.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. I'm just going to run through ICANN 63 for you. ICANN 63 is [inaudible] Barcelona. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, you're very, very muffled.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Can you not hear me? Let me just get [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Now it's perfect.

GISELLA GRUBER: Oh, sorry. There we go. Everyone traveling should already have received their welcome e-mail and be working with [SCM] on their itineraries. We have up here on Adobe Connect room the block schedule version two. It's also posted on the Wiki page. This is an updated version with the cross community and high-interest topic sessions.

You'll see that on Monday we have a 90-minute high-interest topic on EPDP on temporary specification for gTLD registration data. Review of draft report and recommendations.

On Wednesday morning, we have a cross-community session running from 9:45 to 12:00, so an extended slot. This will be on GDPR.

On Thursday morning, we have a 90-minute high-interest topic on innovation in top-level domains.

With regards the general main sessions on Monday, we have the welcome ceremony starting slightly earlier than usual, as on Monday there will be a high-level [inaudible] running all day.

The public forum will be held in two parts. One part on Monday late afternoon and the second part on Thursday afternoon covering the first two 90-minute slots.

Then we also have the ICANN general meeting on Thursday morning – sorry, the [inaudible] meeting. Tuesday remains Constituency Day with the ALAC, however, meeting with the board on Wednesday morning, as you can see.

For the social event, we have the 18:30 to 20:00 for community networking. The gala evening is planned on Wednesday. Then, on Thursday, to round off the week after the six days, we have the ICANN 20th anniversary.

With regards to the At-Large draft schedule, it is posted on the agenda Wiki page. We will not go through this in detail [inaudible] very much in draft format and work in progress. The planning committee will meet

again next week as there have been quite a few moving parts to setting up the At-Large schedule and it is an extremely busy meeting again with all the various PDPs, EPDPs, etc. meetings.

However, we can already confirm that the ALAC will be meeting with various groups. The ccNSO on Sunday afternoon, the GAC on Tuesday, Board on Wednesday. We also are confirming times with the RSSAC and SSAC. The NCSG has invited us to their open session for a 30-minute slot and that's likely to be on Tuesday late afternoon. I will let Alan touch on that afterwards.

As I was saying, the joint At-Large and NCUC outreach session has not yet been finalized. We are looking into several options of two 90-minute slots.

We also have the EURALO virtual general assembly. Again, we're working on timings. The ALT will be held on Thursday afternoon and then a reminder for a session which is on Friday the 26th of October in the morning. The RALO and ALAC development session. It will now be a joint session running from 9:00 to 12:00. This is for ongoing and incoming leaders. And as we don't have any additional funding, everyone will need to leave on the Friday, so please plan your travel accordingly and I am working with constituency travel to see all those who are not able to make the session due to flight constraints.

That is what I have at this stage. Alan or Heidi, would you like to add anything?

ALAN GREENBERG:	Yes, thank you. Two things. Number one, there was an initiative to move the outreach session, the NCSG At-Large outreach session, from Saturday. Has that moved at this point to Sunday, specifically, or is it still on Saturday?
GISELLA GRUBER:	Was that the ALAC with the NCSG open session? Is that correct?
ALAN GREENBERG:	That's correct. The one that was scheduled for two sessions on Saturday. But the NCSG has just woken up and realized that some of their people who normally present at that session will be tied up in the EPDP. There was an e-mail discussion of potentially moving it to Sunday. That would have significant disruptive impact on us and I'm asking to what extent has that happened or is it still being discussed or was it killed?
GISELLA GRUBER:	If I'm not mistaken, there's the joint outreach event with the NCUC which initially was scheduled for Saturday. Then a suggestion was made for Monday morning and as our schedule is still not set yet for Monday morning, the new gTLD subsequent procedures is on at that time, but that was the alternate for the joint outreach session with the NCUC.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. Sorry. I thought it was moving to Sunday is what I thought. I may have gotten that wrong. Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, Gisella, when you were away, there was a discussion or a suggestion to hold it on Saturday. Then there was some discussion by other staff that they should move it to sometime in the week. So that's where I … So, I'm not sure what the end is now. I don't know if Olivier, if you're on the call, if Saturday is still being requested or, Gisella, whether Monday now is the time that everyone is agreeing to.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I e-mailed everyone, I think, and we were asking if we could have Monday. We would have to work this one out, because otherwise, Saturday most people will be in the EPDP and there's quite a few speakers that are in the EPDP that usually participate in the—

ALAN GREENBERG: On the NCSG side.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: On the NCSG side and also … On our side, I guess there's you and that's important enough, perhaps.

ALAN GREENBERG: I've been known to run out of another meeting for ten minutes to speak. The answer is it's still in process.

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may?

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Alan, to interrupt. Just to say that Monday morning is in discussion and I'm checking with meetings team whether we've got a room big enough. Tanzanica is on annual leave until Wednesday so we will no doubt have clarification by Thursday, hopefully, or by the end of this week and I will update everyone on the latest [inaudible] where Monday morning was given as an option. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Unless it's not obviously clear to everyone, I'll make it really clear. The number of other things that are going on, and specifically the EPDP, which doesn't take out a lot of people but does take out me, this is going to be an exceedingly tight meeting to get our work done. We thought Panama was tight. This one is probably going down to a significantly fewer number of hours than we've seen certainly in recent history for At-Large discussions. There will be Saturday, but Saturday is going to be restricted because of a number of people not being there. But, we will do our best. Back to you, Gisella or Heidi. We are starting to run a little bit short on time, so we should try to wrap it up moderately soon.

GISELLA GRUBER:	Heidi, over to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you so much, Gisella. For topics, I just wanted to give you a very brief update on where we are so far. Right now, we're going to be scheduling an ATLAS3 session. This is within an At-Large leadership session. We are also in discussions with Tijani whether the capacity building topic will be discussed within an At-Large leadership session or a separate working group meeting.

The At-Large review implementation working group will hold a 75-minute meeting separate. The topic of CPWG issues, EPDP, etc. will likely take place within an At-Large leadership session.

In terms of people, so far we are going to be schedule Christa Papac who is the ICANN complaints officer, for 15 minutes. We will have Goran and David Olive on the second wrap-up, Leon on the second wrap-up, and also now [Anna Nevis] will be invited to speak for 15 minutes on the Saturday or Sunday.

My question to you is whether you would like members of the GSE to meet with you, among others? Then, just reminders. If you're going to move on away from this topic as a whole, if you could please start thinking about questions you'd like to ask the board in particular, but also Goran, David, and others that you'd like to invite. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you, Heidi. We've asked since time began for questions for the board and for Goran and usually we get almost nothing. Sometimes we

get something for the board. Last time, we had a spirited discussion on the Wiki and on the mailing list on questions for Goran and we condensed them down to a number and he addressed them all and I thought it was a really good meeting. I'd like to see that happening again and I would like to see something similar happening in terms of the board.

We have not yet gotten the board questions that they ask us. Heidi, if you could check and find out when they are forthcoming. I'm hoping they'll be forthcoming after the workshop next week because that will help us frame what it is we want to ask back.

I'm not sure … Obviously, ATLAS3 could be something on the topic or maybe we're best to just keep quiet and not raise an issue like that publicly, depending on what the current status is at the time. We're going to keep a watch on that for the board questions, but to the extent that people can start contributing what they think might be interesting, we'll have plenty of time to narrow that down. But I think we want to get that discussion started sooner rather than later. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Heidi asked if we have to invite the GSE people. I do think that we need to invite them. They have everything in their hands and I think we have a lot of questions to them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else have any comments on that? I wouldn't said just the opposite, actually, that we meet with them every time and is there anything this currently different enough that we need to talk to them at this point? Obviously, within each region, there many be specific things, but for the At-Large group as a whole, I would've thought that that is not necessarily something which is a real hot topic.

I will point out that because Saturday is going to be, to some extent, not available for discussions with the whole ALAC including myself have to participate, there may be an opportunity to have extra time with those kinds of groups on the Saturday. So, that may address that issue. Anyone else have any thoughts on it? I'd appreciate it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, you said last time we didn't have anything to say with them. I don't agree with you. With Sally, we always had a lot of discussion with her and also this time we still have problems with the CROP program. We still have questions amongst our team. And if you read the guidelines, you have to explain and to clarify something, so they have to be there, I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think her team is responsible for CROP, though.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: They are.

HEIDI ULLRICH: If I may. The scope group within policy actually is the support of the CROP. However, GSE is connected, because as you know, in this current fiscal year, there's more of a connection to GSE vice president due to the fact that they have to approve the CROP trip, so there is a connection. So, if I may, we might wish to invite the GSE team as well as some of the scope people to that. Also, perhaps Mandy who is working on IGF activities which will be a few, couple of weeks after Barcelona.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I wanted to ask another question on something unrelated, which was whether we were going to meet or whether the ALAC was going to meet with the RSSAC. I think [inaudible] on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi did not mention it, but they are one of the groups we're trying to meet with.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. RSSAC, SSAC, and the GAC among others. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I think we may want to have Sally but I would like to suggest that she doesn't need to come with all the VPs of the whole team coming. Maybe we need a short time with her and nobody else because she's the one who will [inaudible] answers. [Sorry for that]. We may ask the RALOs whether conversation [inaudible] yet with the VP in their region and that will be enough I guess. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. It is to confirm that [inaudible] be conducting its GNSO assembly and we will have the two regional [inaudible] for both Jean-Jacques Sahel and Alexandra Kulikova.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anything further on ICANN 63? Heidi, you mentioned something which bothers me somewhat and it's bordering on not my responsibility, but I'll mention it anyway. You said that there were no funds for anyone to stay over onto the Saturday regardless of when their flights leave and therefore we're going to have people who will not be at the development session. Now, the development session is not mine, it's Maureen's, but I'm still overseeing this process from a travel point of view of getting people to the meeting. I believe I object strongly to us scheduling a meeting on a day that we're allowed to meet, we have already restricted that day to only half the day, and now saying there may be people who cannot attend because of travel times. I think

ICANN … If that is the case, ICANN is speaking out of both sides of their mouths saying that we are allowed to meet on the Friday and no one told us we could only meet half the day but are then being told people will have to even skip part of that to make their flights. I think this is just completely outrageous. As I said, the actual attendance of the meeting is not my concern, but I believe ICANN ha to make decisions and then stick by them and not change the rules as we fly along and that's what they're doing here. Thank you. And if you can have an action item for the two of us to discuss this, perhaps with Maureen.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have not heard that until now. This is the first I've heard that people might not be able to attend because of flight schedules.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. We'll take it offline, but we've been discussing that with Maureen and Gisella is going to follow-up to make sure that everyone who is going to that half day – it ends at noon – on that Friday will be able to attend that. Now, it may—

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, I am taking a flight where I will probably miss my connection but I will just make it by running out of the room at noon hour. If there hadn't been that flight, there would be no possible way –

if the flight left 20 minutes earlier, there would be no possible way I could make that departure and I would've had to miss the Friday meeting. I may be the only one in that situation.

Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. I have the problem [inaudible]. Normally, I leave in the morning and I asked constituency travel to give me another departure so that I can attend the meeting and they told me I had to pay the difference. I said I will never pay for [inaudible] ICANN. At the end, they accepted. But it was a personal effort and it was [inaudible]. I think that it is something that hasn't happened like this, as you said, and they should [inaudible] position. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Apparently, Heidi was not aware that they had granted an exemption for somebody because he words I heard said there would be no exemptions. I will take this offline. Olivier, in the chat you said they're chopping the meeting week down again. I have no problem – well, I do at some level. But I have no problem with making decisions

that say we can't meet on Friday, we couldn't meet on Friday for financial reasons. But that isn't what they said. They said we could meet on Friday and that's the point I'm making.

Any further last comments on ICANN 63?

We had an any other business item on ATLAS3. I believe we have talked about it sufficiently at this point based on Leon's intervention. Sebastien, you raised the issue. Do you believe there's anything further that needs to be said on that? Sebastien is okay with leaving it as it is.

The public part of the meeting is now over. The ALAC will be meeting in camera which means ALAC members and liaisons plus Olivier as past chair are welcome to stay. Everyone else will have to leave the Adobe Connect room and the bridge and the recording needs to be stopped. I'll give staff time to carry all of that out.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thanks, Alan. We are working on it quickly now.

                          [inaudible], please, Alan. You'll get the recording back on and I'm just going for the confirmation. Yes, the recording is back on and the interpreters are ready to interpret. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. This is Alan Greenberg, chair of the ALAC. The ALAC and its advisors have met in a closed session. We discussed two personnel related issues. Neither of them were resolved and we have some tentative plans moving forward, but there is no explicit action

coming out of this discussion. With that, we've already formally done the any other business and I will close the meeting at this point. Thank you all for attending. Attendance was slightly weak on the ALAC side, but on the non-ALAC side we had marvelous attendance. Let's keep this going. Thank you, all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, bye-bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for the interpreters for staying around for the extra minutes. Appreciate it.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]