

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. We will now officially start the recording on this call. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC leadership team teleconference on Monday the 20th of August, 2018 at 18:30 UTC. On today's call we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Barrack Otieno, Andrei Kolesnikov – we are trying to reconnect him – Yrjö Lansipuro, Seun Ojedeji, León Sanchez, Bastiaan Goslings, Alan Greenberg, and Alfredo Calderon.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Evin Erdogdu, and myself, Andrea Glandon, I'm call management. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and I will now turn it over to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I do not believe we have any action items to discuss.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's correct, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And that puts us right into item three on policy activities, and I'll turn it over to Evin.

---

*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.*

---

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Alan. As you can see, the past month has been particularly busy with the ALAC, there have been four statements approved by the ALAC, which are listed on the agenda. The first being Red Cross names, second and third, the short-term options and long-term options to adjust the timeline of reviews, and the fourth being open data initiative datasets and metadata.

And the current public comments that the ALAC is currently drafting, commenting or voting upon are listed next. The first two do not have a formal deadline, and one of them, the first being ICANN seeking community feedback on proposed unified access models has recently had an update. So I'm not sure if this is something the community wanted to discuss on this call, whether or not to assign an internal deadline, but that's currently in draft mode. And I can move on to the next one if [inaudible] want to assign an internal deadline.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Please.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Okay. So the second one has had a draft posted, but the version has been updated. That's the IPC BC accreditation and access model for nonpublic data. And then the one after this is initial report on new gTLD subsequent procedures, which is being discussed in the weekly CPWG calls. And a draft was recently posted on the next one and the community is commenting upon recommendations for managing IDN variant top-level domains. That closes on the 3rd of September. And finally, the draft ICANN Africa strategic plan for 2016 to 2020 is also

---

currently being drafted, and members of the AFRALO community have said they would contribute to this public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. We have a queue, but I want to ask a question, that if the people responding to the queue happen to want to contribute to, please do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, who's that? We'll ignore it. The question is on the accreditation model and the unified access model. At this point, we have minimal interest and no one really volunteering to do a lot of work on it. Given the amount of effort that's going to go into the EPDP, which will – in some extent is replicating their work, may well build upon it, but in some extent replicating, I'm not going to get overly upset if we don't comment on those. And so as people are chiming in, if you feel differently about that, then please say so. And I guess I'd like to understand how we [address it.] And we have Olivier first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I'm baffled about – well, not baffled, actually. Let's start again. I'm surprised that we still have a comment period for the unified access model. Did we receive an updated unified access model? Because last week, the So and AC leaders were told later

in the week we'll have an updated unified access model with some more things and so we'll be able to work on that. And then the request that I had made which was transmitted and followed up by the CEO was that if there was going to be another unified access model, temporary unified access model based on – temporary spec, sorry, as well based on whatever was going on at the moment between ICANN and law courts and things like that, that the work would be well synchronized with the EPDP people. And it seems that that's the case. So I would tend to agree with you that we don't need to comment on the proposed unified access model, but I wondered whether there was any update on this in the meantime [and whether] the goalposts have moved. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It may well have moved. I honestly don't know if they announced it or not. I think they did. I think this is very much of a case of the king is dead, long live the king, and we didn't comment on the last unified access model, therefore the question today is, do we comment on the one that's relevant today? So the question stands regardless of whether it was updated yesterday or will be updated tomorrow. The question is, do we put a lot of focus on it? And not hearing a response, we'll go to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Just relating to the subsequent procedure work, I just wanted to draw the ALT's attention to something that they may need to take action on because of the date that Jeff and I are asking people to respond it to. Jeff sent an e-mail out only a little while ago, a few

---

---

minutes ago, so you may not have seen it yet, but in preparation for us looking at measuring our consensus of a final report, we've requested that every constituency, stakeholder group and advisory committee designate one person and an alternate that is empowered to speak for that particular group in our discussions as we go through –

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, we missed the verb, is empowered?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To speak on behalf of.

ALAN GREENBERG: Speak on. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because this is in the post public comment period, so the rationale here is that we want to just remind everybody that we are not looking at these things quantitatively, we're looking at them qualitatively. So we're not going to get into the black hole of waiting and all that sort of thing and people from the GAC being concerned that too many people from the GNSO are talking.

So if possible, we want to have – not trying to stop anyone's voice, but we want to be able to say, okay, Mary Smith, is that the view of the At-Large Advisory Committee and the At-Large? And they can say yes it is

---

or no it's not. Or we'll get back to you. But we need those names by September 14th. That's why I'm bringing it up now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Anyone else want to speak? I have a comment on the subsequent procedures, but I'll open the floor to anyone else first. No? Okay. We are starting to see some comments. If it wasn't for Justine Chew, I'm not sure how many we'd have, however. We really need to get other people who are starting to contribute into this. I have put off posting anything. I will over the next number of days, but I think it's really important we just not have one or two people.

In terms of who we name, that's an interesting question. Cheryl says we may put her forward as the spokesperson. My question is, does she have enough background to be able to speak on things that she personally doesn't have opinions on? And one might want to think about that. I don't think we want to name anyone today.

So if anyone has any thoughts about how do we actually get more people active, it would be good. The number of people we had on the call on, the last CPWG call who were not part of the core group, that is ALAC members or sort of the – not wanting to sound negative, but the usual suspects, the number is very small. And the number of those people who actually comment is even smaller.

So somehow, we have to attract people into this group. Putting out notice for the CPWG on short notice and then having the wrong URL and no agenda posted, I think – I'm not sure either of those will fix the problem, but they certainly exacerbate it. Hopefully, we'll do better this

---

week than we did last. Any further thoughts? I see no hands. Then I guess we'll go on to the next item. Evin, are there any decisions we need to make at this point though?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. Actually, there are two statements, new public comments that is, to which the ALAC needs to make decisions. The first one is study on technical use of rootzone label generation rules, and the second is modification of domains protected marks list service.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe we have sent out a message on the first one. Can you tell me if I'm correct or not?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I don't believe we sent anything out on the second one.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Right. And the first one so far hasn't received anyone from the community indicating any interest in commenting. So I guess –

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we'll – from my perspective, if it dies, it dies. On the second one, is there any interest in this group? I hear nothing, I see nothing. Have we sent out one to the ALAC and At-Large community on that one yet?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Just a general announcement, but I can send a kind of last call e-mail if you'd like, or I can mark it as no statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just leave it be and we'll bring it up at the ALAC meeting when it comes up.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Okay. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Any further issues on policy before we move on? Then we'll move on to any reports from liaisons that believe they need to report something to us at this point. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Very briefly, with the GNSO council call that ran on the 16th of this month, two items of note out of the agenda that I just wanted to raise to your attention. The first one was that we were going to have a vote on the adoption of the final report of protection to certain Red Cross names as gTLDs. Luckily, this is the first time that this has come before council as a vote, because the Noncommercial



---

Stakeholder Group blocked it going through for further discussion and voting, which as you know, Alan, anyone can do once and then you have to just deal with it in the next meeting. So I'll get back to you in September about what the upshot of that is. I know a number of our people worked on that, and I want to keep them apprised. The concern was a lack of understanding of the legal basis for a number of the activities. It's a bit like dancing on the head of a pin. There's been advice, there's toing and froing. I'll keep you apprised of it. But if anyone was looking at the agenda, [you won't be thinking that that's come true.] It did not, the vote did not occur.

The other one that was of interest to us because of the amount of work that we put in – and particularly the amount of agreement that we had with the outcomes of the Work Stream 2 final report, they – again, Noncommercial Stakeholder Group have decided to support a vote on that, but they are most concerned that according to them, their particular voices were ignored and not heard. And so hell will be raised if this ever happens in the future that the GNSO council votes on things like the CCWG on Accountability report as a block. In future, they want the council to vote on them item by item out of the recommendations, because I gather they would have voted some of them – in particular to do with the ombuds office – down. And that's it from me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Which reminds me, what's the current status with regard to the ALAC and that report? We had it on our agenda originally. It was for Panama. It was taken off the agenda. To be honest, I can't even remember why, but something came up at the last moment that caused

---

it not to be quite ready. Can somebody remind me? Cheryl probably knows, there may be others, but I'm having a complete mental block right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl only knows that the ALAC [has two weeks] to deal with it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but why was it we deferred it? Something happened at the full-day meeting, I thought, that caused it not to be ready for voting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't know why it wasn't ready for voting. I mustn't have been in the room at the time. But, you know, obviously you didn't.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we didn't because it was taken off our agenda explicitly, not because we didn't have time. Okay, I'll deal with Tijani and try to re-put this back together. If we can have an action item for me to do that, please. He who was very eager to have us approve it in Panama, I haven't heard anything from him on it since. So I'm a little bit concerned. But I will get back to that. Yes, Yrjö is next, I believe.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yes. Thank you, Alan. In Barcelona, we're going to have again a joint meeting with the GAC. There will be a preparatory call. I think the doodle is out for that, but before that, I was very happy if I would get

---

from our ALT members and our ALAC members ideas for agenda items in addition to what are the sort of perennial items like new gTLDs and the GDPR. I could mention that with [Anna,] the GAC liaison to ALAC who was appointed at the Panama meeting, we have been – we have started to draft a joint follow-up to the joint ALAC-GAC statement that we gave – issued in Abu Dhabi about the informed meaningful participation and so on and so forth. But as I said, I would welcome any ideas for new items at our meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I would like to suggest that instead of GDPR, which is a rather general one, we talk a little bit about cooperation and working together as a team on the EPDP. I believe at least some of our targets are the same, and to the extent we can work cooperatively and provide a unified front as opposed to saying different things, that might be useful. So perhaps you could do a little bit of brainstorming on that. Question, is [Anna] on our mailings lists, the one that she has asked to be put on, or has that not happened yet? Anybody?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, yes, I believe she's got all mailing lists that she [were] instructed.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay.

---

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan, for that suggestion. So I have noted that and [take that up later with Anna.] Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, that's more for leadership of the GAC to think about how we can do it, not necessarily for discussion with the plenary.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anybody else with any reports? Otherwise, after a late start, we'll be back on time. Then the next item is in fact EPDP. At this point, we are still just finishing what is called the triage phase, that part of the charter was for us, the EPDP, to report back to the GNSO, essentially on a paragraph by paragraph basis – or a section by section basis if not paragraph – of the temporary spec, and to give a synopsis of how much disagreement we have.

The hope, I think, at the time was we would find out that a significant part of the temporary spec was deemed to be acceptable and we could focus our discussions on the small number of items that ended up being problematic. The reality is that virtually every paragraph or small group of paragraphs had someone who is disagreeing with it. In some cases, they are relatively minor things that have to be changed. You know, the date no longer applies because it's now passed, or it can't refer to the temporary spec, it must refer to the policy. But in many cases, there are

---

many substantive changes, and we haven't started talking about those, but we have noted that there's a lot of them.

It's going to be interesting to see how we proceed. We should finish the triage work this week, perhaps even tomorrow's meeting, and I really don't know how we're going to go forward, but that's the point I think at which we will start opening up things to the CPWG group and look at how do we answer certain questions.

And I have a question for this group. The CPWG, remember, is a composite group that we are using mainly for meetings, and the question is when we start talking about substantive EPDP things, my inclination is to use the gTLD issues sub-list or list – and still, obviously, we'll use the CPWG for our meetings, but any getting down to nitty gritty on particular questions, that we should focus to the people who have a specific interest and perhaps knowledge of the gTLD subject.

Is there any disagreement on that? I see Yrjö has his hand up. I'm not sure if it's a previous hand or a current one. Yrjö? That was an old hand. Anyone have any thoughts, or is there no disagreement that we'll focus on the gTLD list with people who have a particular interest in that subject and not try to broadcast it to everyone, many of whom may consider it spam. I see no disagreement. So I will – I and the other EPDP folks will take that direction.

Okay. I don't really have anything else to report on the EPDP. The workload has certainly not been anywhere near the 30-hour estimate, but then again, there really hasn't been any work at this point done, other than the people on the EPDP, Hadia, myself and our two

---

alternates working on the triage statements. And there hasn't been a great deal of disagreement on those issues. To a large extent, I think the ALAC was moderately happy with the temporary spec as it stood, with a few glaring exceptions. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Sorry, I had a phone issue and I've taken my AC off mute so I could make sure I didn't listen [inaudible] anything I was listening to. Okay, try again. Just back on EPDP, I was going to mention this, but I thought EPDP is the following agenda item. I was going to mention it for my GNSO report. In GNSO council discussion on EPDP, it was resolved that the council will receive weekly updates from their liaisons, just a brief report. Now, I see absolutely no reason why I can't pass that on. I was going to suggest I pass it on to the CPWG, which I certainly can do, but it seems to me like I should also then copy that across to the gTLD-specific issues mailing lists. So I'll action that if you want me to.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that would be appreciated.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just falling back on a previous note of yours, Cheryl, regarding the NCSG asking for a deferral on the – sorry, my mind has gone blank.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Red Cross.

ALAN GREENBERG: On the Red Cross issue, Chuck Gomes, who, as many of you know, is about the politest person you've ever met, and he did post a message saying it's very disappointing that the NCSG failed to participate in the process and then requests a deferral without any further comment. Alright, next item is the At-Large review status, and we have Maureen and Cheryl on that one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can jump in on that, if you like. Maureen has been head down and tail up, metaphorically speaking, at least, with the [inaudible] meeting. So I've been helping steer the boat for this last week. We have our first meeting of what is a full complement of ALAC and regionally represented people. That should be running, I believe, Tuesday next week at 19:00 UTC. That's going to obviously cover a couple of things on our startup agenda. There's a little bit of kickstarting required, because not everyone appointed to the ARIWG. I've got to be able to say it as a word, I just haven't worked out how yet. [inaudible] No, it doesn't work for me.

Anyway, they may not be as deeply entrenched with the recommendations as we are, so we'll do a little bit of making sure everyone's on a level set and knows what's going on. We hope to have had at least a basic draft proposal of timelines and initial reporting

---

template put together for the group's review. We are painfully aware that a full month will have gone past since the resolution was [put] and this will be our first meeting, but to be honest, I'm not terribly fearful that we will fall behind our schedule at all. Do you want to know any more than that, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a question from Bastiaan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Bastiaan.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible]

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: [inaudible] Well, I'm glad to have a floor, but I didn't have a particular question. It was a typo. I'm sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]



---

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not an old hand, it's an error hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, just to assure people that everyone who is on the ARIWG list as a member is already on our mailing list, and they'll be receiving their [iCal] invitations, etc. [inaudible] But we've also had, at least from one region, and I expect [to] come from other regions, participants or observers put their hand up. So just as a reminder, we will be accepting people to be engaged in the meetings and in the mailing list, but they won't be capital M members as such. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I assume once we start on building real tasks, we'll hopefully attract a lot more people. Any further comments on the review? Clearly, as Cheryl has pointed out a number of times, the clock is ticking on our first six-month report. Next item is ICANN 63, and my name is listed first on the list of speakers, but that is clearly incorrect and I will turn the floor over to Gisella.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well –

ALAN GREENBERG: Or I'll turn the floor over to Heidi. I'm sorry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. So again, my name is not listed there, but since Gisella is on [annual] leave today and not able to join us, I'm going to do my best to go over this. But again, we'll see how that goes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any good boss can take over any task of one of their subordinates.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Absolutely. There we go. So I'm going to just go over this. This is the second version, again, it's very much subject to change. So, Alan, you just asked that I go over some of the groups that we're going to be meeting with in Barcelona, so I'm prepared to do that. Also, we had a prep call on Thursday, so I can review some of those decisions there for the working groups that are going to have meetings as well as one or two of the RALOs.

So rather than going down each of the days, etc., again, this is also subject to change, just to let you know that the ALAC will be meeting with the SSAC, the RSSAC, the GAC – again, that's a 45-minute session versus a full hour given their time limitations due to their high-level government meetings. Then also the NCSG has invited the ALAC to speak with them, as well as the board. Time with the board is being confirmed currently. Those are the groups that we're meeting.

So working groups, [inaudible] it was requested by Daniel, chair of the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement, to have a call, so that will be scheduled. Gisella will be checking with Tijani whether that group

---

---

would like a separate call versus being part of an At-Large leadership group or session. Other working groups that are going to be part of the At-Large working session will be the CPWG, ATLAS III – those are the two that I'm aware of at the moment – RALOs. It was decided that EURALO will have their annual virtual general assembly, so again, that's open to all EURALO members in Barcelona as well as to those that will be calling in remotely, and then also, the traditional AFRALO [Afrikaans] meeting will be scheduled. Alan, any questions, or anyone?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have a couple of comments. Given that some of us – and perhaps a fair number of us are either committed to or interested in the EPDP sessions which are going to run all Saturday plus another three-hour session somewhere else, that is in competition with working group sessions – not our working group, but with AC/SO allocatable time, this is going to be a really tight meeting. The number of hours that we have for general overall discussion on any subject is going to be minuscule compared to – as far as I can tell – past meetings, probably about half as much.

So it's going to be a real challenge to use that time well and to try to have substantive discussions without cutting people off too much. But to that end, we really need to identify the things that we need to have on the agenda very, very soon. There just isn't going to be a lot of flexibility to add things towards the end. So Heidi has already given us a shortlist. We'll be circulating that. We also have an e-mail out asking people for input. We typically get relatively little input on that.

But I think we're going to have to firm that up very quickly, and we're going to have to make a number of hard decisions, because we simply can't do everything that we might want to do. There's just not going to be enough hours in this meeting to come anywhere close to doing that. And there are a number of things that are going to be pretty essential that we have to work on. Some of them [will] take a lot of time but they're going to have to be done. And meetings with the groups that Heidi already mentioned, I think, are pretty essential. Our meetings with SSAC are usually very productive. The GAC, the same thing.

I've asked to meet with the RSSAC this time for two reasons. Number one, as part of their – as our comment to their organization review, we said we strongly support more interactions between the RSSAC and our group, so I think we need to put our money where our mouth is, so to speak.

And second, I think we want to learn a little bit more about the recent RSSAC proposal to essentially revamp and revitalize the root server system, and perhaps more importantly, to involve ICANN in it as opposed to it being a completely separate body with no connection to ICANN. And that's a rather revolutionary change. And if it happens, it will be, I think, a very important event going forward, probably more important than the IANA transition when it comes down to real operational issues.

And that's about all I have right now. So we're going to have to start working soon, we're going to have to work very fast because the meeting is creeping up, but more important, because of the time constraints, we will have very little flexibility. Back to you, Heidi.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you. Just a question that I have on my notes for ICANN 63 is whether to invite Krista Papac to speak to the At-Large group.

ALAN GREENBERG: They did ask to speak. What actually I would like someone to do – and I can give them the pointers – is we have one or two options. We can have her come in for seven minutes, introduce herself and say she's available, or we can have her talk a little bit more about kinds of things she's worked on. Some of the things she's worked on are very much registry and registrar-focused, because one of the main reasons for setting it up was complaints from those groups that there is no one who can respond to an issue they have. So that was certainly one of the motivations for setting it up.

I don't know to what extent the kinds of things she's worked on, and there are a number of reports on her website, might be of more interest to us. And I'd welcome someone on the ALT taking a look at the kinds of things and saying, is this going to be a good use of us devoting 30 minutes or something like that, or perhaps even longer. So if there's a volunteer, I would certainly appreciate [doing it and having] someone do that. doesn't have to be an ALT member, but someone who's willing to look at it and provide us an analysis of whether this is a good thing or a bad thing to involve the whole community of 30 people. Of course, the alternative is to schedule it on Saturday where there'll be more time available, but fewer people. Anyone have any interest in the subject? That alone may be an answer, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Well, again, [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, let's invite her for a ten-minute overview of what she does so we know she exists, people know what she looks like, and can follow up [inaudible] if they wish.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So she's asked for 20. So could we compromise at 15?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you for that. Okay, so that – again, this is still in fluctuation, the schedule. Olivier, did you wish to talk a little bit about the latest plans for the At-Large/EURALO NCSG [event?]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Heidi. Well, we discussed it earlier and I actually quickly mentioned it just before this. We're likely to have a joint session, basically, on the – I think it's the Saturday afternoon now, day one, and we just had Siranush on the previous call and she mentioned that they have the fellowship going on until 3:00 in the afternoon, and then there's nothing after that. And so we were hoping that maybe we can

---

get the same room and then have the joint At-Large/NCSG – in fact, it's At-Large NCUC, for a reason that escapes me, by the way, because I thought it was going to be NCSG and now they've done a U-turn and it's back to NCUC for some reason. But we're not there to fix their politics.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, Olivier, to be clear, it's now Saturday in competition with the EPDP?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Competition would be EPDP at the end of the day, because otherwise, we're with Sunday, and Sunday is in competition with the GNSO council, isn't it?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, so it is always going to be in competition with something, unfortunately.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So it would be in competition with the EPDP, it would be late, so it would be 3:15 until 6:30 PM, and after that there is a fellowship drink thing as well, a cocktail going on. So we'll follow on with the drinks and cocktails on that. And that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: For clarity, is this At-Large NCUC or EURALO NCUC?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, it's one of these things that we have to kind of work out here. We could make it At-Large NCUC or we could make it EURALO NCUC. I'm not sure when it comes down to the level of in an organizational structure, which is better. Should we make it specifically EURALO NCUC, or should we make it At-Large NCUC? In the past, we've had both, and the name hasn't really made much difference.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but for clarity, if we're involving people like the fellows who come from multiple regions, I think labeling it as a EURALO event – I don't think is appropriate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. [inaudible]



ALAN GREENBERG: That's my take. You also have a better chance of attracting people to work on it if it's not just EURALO.

OLIIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's [inaudible] on the table, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Heidi has her hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Alan. Just a thought as we go into the implementation of the new fellowship program where the SOs and ACs are going to be selecting some of the fellows, I think as At-Large does their outreach, I think that looking for people who might be possible fellowship people would be useful, and hence using At-Large would be much more important when doing outreach. [An idea.] Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless you're planning on getting money, which is easier to get by calling it EURALO, I see no pluses on the side of calling it just EURALO. And I see some negatives.

---

OLIIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There are two people in favor of calling it At-Large. Is there anyone in favor of calling it EURALO? I'm sorry, I'm not at my computer so I can't see any answer on that. But I'm absolutely fine with At-Large.

ALAN GREENBERG: We now have a comment from the Caribbean saying even if it is EURALO, call it At-Large. And Bastiaan says call it At-Large. So I think we have a consensus.

OLIIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Next, anything else on the ICANN 63?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Absolutely, yes. I do want to stress and encourage all of you and the full to start considering the questions for the CEO, for León who's here, for the GSE who you may wish to meet with, the board, and [inaudible] workspace as Andrea is putting them into the chat. But again, the earlier the better. They're often way too late to have the people actually

---

understand and fully prepare to answer those questions. So just to encourage you to do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll note that for the first time ever at the last meeting, when we put out a question of what would you like to ask the CEO, we got answers back. We got lots of answers back, and we ended up melding them down into a few questions. And in fact, not only did we ask the questions, but Göran addressed many of them. So let's try to do that again. And again, the questions for the board, just remember what people's responsibilities are. The board makes substantive strategy decisions. Göran is in charge of implementing them, so he doesn't make the decisions but he has to implement them and has the staff reporting to him. So let's try to target the questions at the right body and hopefully have an interesting meeting. Heidi, back to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. Just final point, just to make sure everyone is aware that the wrap-up sessions will be on Wednesday, there will be two of them, and we'll be inviting Göran, David and León to the second wrap-up session [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. It's interesting, wrap-up sessions move earlier and earlier in the week each time.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH:

[inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Perhaps next meeting we should just start on the wrap-up and continue with the rest of them afterwards. That was a joke. Maybe. Anything further on ICANN 63 on anyone's part? I see no hands, I hear no one screaming out, I think we're over that idea, that issue. And the next one is, does anyone have anything they would particularly like to see on the ALAC agenda coming up? That is coming up a little over a week from now. Well, that agenda typically gets firmed up a few days before the meeting, if we're lucky, so if you have anything you want to see, please send it to Heidi or me, or both.

And any other – oh, no, we have one other item, which is in the wrong place on the agenda, it's before Any Other Business – or after, it should be before, is just a quick update on auction proceeds. For those of you who've been following the process, the working group for the last year plus has been looking at four different mechanisms by which the auction funds could be administered, and – let me get – I want to make sure I get the right thing up here.

The four different options that have been looked at are an ICANN department, essentially a department cordoned off from others but sharing resources if necessary. So we would not replicate accounts payable and human resources and such. The second option is an ICANN department but partnering with some external charitable or nonprofit organization that has some experience in the types of things that we'll

---

be doing, although almost surely not in the exact same area as what we've been doing.

The third option was setting up a foundation that is an arm's length organization. The money essentially gets transferred to them. The ICANN board and ICANN still has the responsibility ultimately for ensuring the funds are used in support of the ICANN mission, which is an absolute requirement, but it will essentially be outsourced largely to this new wholly owned subsidiary, not unlike the PTI is for IANA. It could in theory still share some resources with ICANN under contract but would be separate and certain costs associated with it, and also certain restrictions because a foundation, a trust set up in the U.S. has certain restrictions as to what it can and cannot do.

And the fourth option is to outsource the operation completely, again with ICANN remaining in a position to control fiduciarily what is done with the money, but everything is done under contract. As I said, we'd be spending an inordinate amount of time discussing these options and the implications of them, and the group is now at a point where we would like to narrow these options.

The intent, by the way, is to have an interim report ready, I believe for Barcelona, although I personally question whether we're going to be able to do that. There was a suggestion made by the leadership that we eliminate the last two options and focus on the ICANN department, [inaudible] ICANN department plus a partner. There was at least one significant objection on the call, and we now have a poll out which is due in about a week from now.

---

In an attempt to hopefully end up with the ALAC voices speaking in unanimity instead of essentially each of us voting against each other and perhaps cancelling each other out, I took a poll of the five members plus a couple of other people who have been reasonably active in the procedure. The conclusion I've come to is there is no chance at all that we will – or almost no chance that we are going to come to closure and agree on a single set of priorities. But we are trying to work towards some common ground, and we may – we'll likely actually have a call later this week to try to [hassle] out some of the differences we have.

But at this point, there are sufficient differences that I would put not much money on the fact that we're going to come to complete closure and agree on a single set of answers. So I just thought I'd update you on that. Maureen is the other person on this call who's been active in this group. Did I miss anything that needs to be added? If Maureen can speak.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. I have got someone mowing a lawn right next door and I can hardly hear, but yes, we have had quite a lot of discussion, and I'm sure [inaudible] amicable agreement. So thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. You're more positive than I am. That's good. Alright, unless there are any questions, we'll go on to the next item. And the next item is Any Other Business. I had none. Does anyone have Any Other Business? Not seeing any, then the ALT will now go into an in camera session. That is the ALT and advisors which are the advisors, which are the formal

---

liaisons to other ACs and SOs, plus the past chairs. And if I could ask staff to, number one, stop the recording and confirm it's –

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, just one moment, please.

ANDREA GLANDON: Okay, recording has started, and you may go forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The At-Large leadership team and advisors has met in a confidential in camera session to discuss two personnel-related issues. There was no decision taken as to how to move forward on either of them, but discussions will continue, and hopefully, we'll be able to bring this to the ALAC within a week or so. Thank you all. And this meeting has officially ended. Bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, and bye.

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes [inaudible] lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]