

ANDREA GLANDON:

We will now officially start the recording of this call. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Tuesday, the 2nd of October, 2018 at 21:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Daniel Nanghaka, Barrack Otieno, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Javier Rua-Jovet, Yrjö Lansipuro, John Laprise, Alan Greenberg, Kaili Khan, Ricardo Holmquist, Sébastien Bachollet, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Vanda Scartezini, Andrei Kolesnikov, Joanna Kuleszka, Leah Symekher, Maritza Agüero, Alberto Soto, Gabriel Bombambo.

We have apologies noted from Judith Hellerstein, Marita Moll, León Sánchez, Amrita Choudhury, Bastiaan Goslings, and Adrian Schmidt. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Evin Erdogdu, Siranush Vardanyan, Claudia Ruiz, and myself, Andrea Glandon on call management. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and for the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels. Please speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, and that's the last time I'm going to be hearing those words as ALAC chair on an ALAC call. So, this is a momentous meeting for me. Does anyone have anything to add to the agenda or Any Other Business? Not seeing anyone. I do note we have a couple of

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.

people with microphones open. If we could – we have Abdulkarim and Vanda who are speaking every time I speak according to Adobe Connect. If perhaps they can be muted.

Alright, with no other comments on the agenda or AOC we'll proceed to the first item, which is outstanding action items. And since I see we have zero minutes, there are no outstanding action items that need the attention of the ALAC, and we'll go immediately to policy development activities. Evin, if you could summarize quickly where we are on any open ones and tell us what is new that we need decisions on.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Alan. Currently, there are four statements in process. the first is at a vote currently, but it will close later today or tonight depending on where you are. It's the new gTLD sub pro ALAC statement. Penholder was Jonathan Zuck, and it was submitted this week.

Then two more currently have a draft posted in the Wiki workspace. The first is ICANN [seeking] community feedback on proposed unified access model, and Greg Shatan is penholder and he is working on updating it in advance of the CPWG call tomorrow.

The next one that has a draft posted as of today is next steps on reviews. Penholder is Alan Greenberg, and call for comments was issued today and call for comments will close on the 4th. And the final one currently in draft mode is proposed gTLD registration data access protocol, RDAP profile. Joanna Kulesza and Jonathan Zuck are penholders, this one closes on the 13th of October.

And there are three additional public comments currently open which have not formally been decided upon for discussion on today's call, the first being registration directory service, RDS WHOIS2 review team draft report of recommendations, the second being proposals for Malayalam and Tamil scripts rootzone label generation rules, and the third, draft PTI and IANA FY20 operating plan and budget.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Evin. Any comments to start with on the ones that are in progress, the ones that are either commenting or being voted on? I will note that the gTLD comment, I believe, sets the record for the longest comment we have ever submitted. In draft form, it was about 100 pages long. I'm not quite sure how long it was in the final version, but on stamina, if nothing else, it does win, and I hope it will come close on quality as well. Cheryl, do you want to comment on one of those or one of the open ones?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I wanted to comment on that one specifically. And I'm certainly putting on my subsequent procedures PDP co-chair hat. And I just wanted to formally thank the ALAC via you, Alan, but very specifically to pull out Jonathan and Olivier, the work that the CPWG has done on this. Yes, it is heroic if you just count the number of words and pages, but volume does not necessarily mean quality. I'm quite confident that what we have here is something I'm confident in.

So the process, I think, has been given a – the consolidated policy working group has been given more than you would have expected the

average first test would be with a heroic, 300-page document to review, but I just wanted to compliment you and perhaps ask that the ALAC [say it] formally back to the CPWG what an extraordinary effort it was and how much it's appreciated. But certainly, yeah, I think it worked damn near seamlessly. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, and I'll highlight one other person, Justine Chew, who did an awful lot of the groundwork on this, and much appreciated. Any other comments on those open ones before we go on to the ones that we have to do something about? Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. And I don't think [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you're at the bottom of a long tunnel underwater.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, it's the lovely London phone thing, isn't it? Okay. Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's slightly better. Not great, but better.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I can't put the microphone any closer, otherwise it will actually get to be in the back of my throat, which is a little bit difficult. I'm right on the mic at the moment. I was going to say Jonathan isn't here, but he still deserves a majority of the credit for this for having [inaudible] coordinate and get all of the different people in. And I'd like to also join all the people that have taken part in this. Many members of the consolidated policy working group, and it's good to see the community all being active and not just one person or two or three, but a lot of people are being active in this. So it's a really good thing, and I hope that this will continue. And I want anyone who's not yet on the consolidated policy working group to join it, because that's where the action is. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And to be clear, one doesn't join the consolidated group, one joins one of the three subgroups, the gTLD group, registration issues, or ICANN evolution group, and that automatically makes you a member of the CPWG. And since we're highlighting people, I'll also highlight Jonathan who isn't here who did the unforgiving work of creating the infrastructure on which we could all then comment, which was a huge effort in its own right.

Alright, we have three public comments that are open right now. One is easy, one is rootzone label generation rules, and our normal policy is to not comment on those. And the ALT is recommending that we do that. ALT met just a few hours ago, so all of this is fresh.

The second one is the draft budget and operating plan for PTI and IANA, the fiscal year 21. And my recommendation supported by the ALT is to ask Jean-Jacques Subrenat who we've just put onto the PTI review team and Mohamed El Bashir who is our member on the Customer Standing Committee to review the documents and make a recommendation on whether they believe there's something we need to comment on or that we should just be silent on.

And unless there is any opposition to that, I will do that. I'll wait a moment for people to raise their opposition. Not hearing any – oh, Holly is opposing. Yes, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: No I'm not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Holly has her hand up. Please go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I'm not ,but I'm just thinking, can we – given that with the new sort of policy group, one of the items is about looking at both the general assembly and the ATLAS, whoever is looking at the budget, can we start to look at the review team in terms of what comes out of the review that we've asked for more money, and coordinate that as well so that the task of the two – and I'm very happy with them – can actually liaise with the other people as to out of the recommendations from the review, where are the requests for money, and coordinate that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, I think you are confusing two different documents, one which is the ICANN fiscal year plan and budget, which isn't out yet, and this is the PTI and IANA budget.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, okay. Sorry. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which is why I suggested the two people who are reigning experts on IANA and PTI who are also our members on the coordinating committee that oversaw the IANA transition, as it turns out.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, so we have support for that. the last one is one that I am in an awkward position on, and I'll raise the issue and see if anyone else wants to speak to it, and that is the RDS WHOIS2 review team draft report which came out a few weeks ago. It is open until a week after the ICANN meeting. And as chair of that group, I don't think it would be proper for me to write any comments on behalf of the ALAC.

But there are a number of issues raised in it related to things like contractual compliance, but not the only one, that have been near and dear to At-Large and the ALAC in the past, and there may be some

interest in it. Would anyone like to speak to this subject, or would anyone like to volunteer? We will be raising it at the CPWG meeting tomorrow.

Hands. I did see Ricardo's hand up for a moment and it disappeared. I don't know if he was trying to talk on this item or the previous one. If Ricardo would like to take the floor though, he may. Please go ahead, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yeah, Alan. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can, well.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: No, [inaudible] the prior one, the draft PTI and IANA operating plan. Just send a note to the planning committee [inaudible]. There is a minor mistake there about the people. Supposedly, the IANA one includes the PTI, and the PTI says it has more people than the combined one of the [inaudible] clarification. I will send you the e-mail [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: And you can bring it up at the CPWG meeting tomorrow if you're there. Thank you for looking at that. Anyone have any thoughts on how do we address the RDS review? Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. No, just making sure that any ALAC member or regional leader had the opportunity to speak first. Again, I'm popping on my subsequent procedures co-chair hat, but not totally taking off my GNSO liaison one. I think it's extraordinarily important that the CPWG, the consolidated policy working group look at this, and I would like to think with ALAC's support and encouragement, make a comment on this.

It has a number of recommendations in it that has a nexus to a number of areas, not the least of which of course is at least four or five of them that affect subsequent procedures. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There's also some interesting things [that I'll call] people attention. There's been a lot of discussion within the ALAC obviously on GDPR and the impact that GDPR will have on our world. And the review team did a law enforcement study that has some rather interesting numbers in it, and we were surprised at how clear the message was from those numbers, but you might find it interesting to look at that. Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I suppose reluctantly, I'll put my hand up. Is there anything in the report – and you just mentioned one thing – that we haven't said a lot of times in the WHOIS context? And I think the other reservation is there is so much going on in the EPDP about WHOIS that we're going to have to [calm down,] get our heads around. I'm reluctant to embark on something that is related to that perhaps and put a lot of time into that when in fact there's so much with the EPDP that we're all going to have to focus on. So, are there things – and you would know best – in the actual review that we're not going to be thinking about in the PDP, the whole EPDP process?

ALAN GREENBERG: There is very little overlap between the review and EPDP.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: There could have been, but there was not a lot of merit in us trying to guess what ICANN was going to do for [ADP] or evaluate the impact of it. So we drift into that in a couple of places where we couldn't avoid it, because there are clear impacts on some things. Some of them are known already.

For instance, a significant part of the report is analyzing to what extent were the first WHOIS review team recommendation implemented. ICANN had looked at all of the recommendations and put a green tick beside them. We ended up putting a green tick beside half of them, and

have some concern with the other half that we do not believe they were properly implemented. So that alone is an issue.

As an example, one of the recommendations out of the first WHOIS team was make WHOIS a strategic priority. And I will ask the question, if it was a strategic priority, how come GDPR surprised us? So, one of the other recommendations, reach out to bodies that are not normally part of the ICANN process to educate them on WHOIS. To what extent did we reach out to privacy commissioners and educate them? It may not have made any difference, who knows, but it wasn't something that we did.

So there's a lot in the report, and there are a number of new things, some of which will be made more complex. The whole concept of WHOIS accuracy when we might not be able to see most of it is clearly and issue. We don't know at this point whether ICANN will be able to see most of it or not. So, there are a lot of issues that do drift into GDPR, but there are also a large number of issues that are unrelated to GDPR and may or may not matter. And to what extent they may matter will vary depending on how GDPR unfolds. So it's not as if the issue is not relevant, but the overlap is not all that large.

And some of it, for instance – I'll give you another tidbit, one of the recommendations of the first WHOIS review was create a WHOIS portal so people can go to one place and get the definitive WHOIS information. And ICANN did do that. It is completely broken now because of GDPR implementation. It could be fixed, it is fixable, but it hasn't been fixed. So that's another example of, yes, it relates to GDPR, but it isn't waiting for the outcome. So there's all sorts of things like that.

Cheryl, please go ahead. And this is a subject, obviously, of some interest to me and I can go on for a long time. I won't, but I would like to get to the point where hopefully, someone in ALAC and At-Large will take it on. Cheryl, please go ahead. Assuming that was as new hand.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Alan, look, I would be happy to work with you on this one, but that's really for the policy working group. I think there is a bit of overlap. For instance, you talked about the accuracy. Now, I only read – I didn't listen to – the transcript of the Los Angeles meeting, but there was a whole section in there where in fact Compliance was talking about what they would see and what they wouldn't see. So I just actually see some areas where I think there is an overlap that we'd have to work through.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Remember, what they are seeing is under the temporary spec, not under the final implementation.

HOLLY RAICHE:

That's right. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You're not going to get me to say there's no overlap, but there's not a lot of overlap between the recommendations we're making and GDPR.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Are you throwing this to the policy working group to determine, or do you want it determined here?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it's going to the policy group, I'm just trying to do some consciousness raising here.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I don't really want to spend a lot more time on it, time is running. But if there are no other hands, then we'll go on to the next item, and hopefully, the CPWG will figure out a way to address this particular comment. Next item is review of ALS and individual member applications, and I'll turn it first over to Evin for a quick summary of where we are in numbers, and then I extended the time on this more than we normally allocate because I'd like to look at where we are in terms of individual members. But Evin, please go ahead.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. So, with the ALS snapshot which is on the agenda, we have an increase in ALSes. We now have 231 in 103 countries and territories. The two most recently certified At-Large structures are Alternative Incorporated from NARALO and the ISOC chapter from Saint Vincent and the Grenadines in LACRALO. And one was decertified, that's

Knujon from NARALO. And we have several others awaiting regional advice and process of due diligence.

And then moving on to the individual snapshots, we now have 91 individuals and eight observers, and five were recently certified from three different RALOs, and we have one application from an individual. And this individual may withdraw their application to apply at a later time as an At-Large structure. And that's all. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Maureen, you have your hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Yeah, I wanted to actually talk after you mentioned about the membership of the individual members, but I think that one of the things that I'm concerned about – and probably getting a little bit more concerned at the moment – is the actual registration process and the applications. I think that that's one of the things we really do need to review and get some clarification on some of those issues.

One of the things I was looking at for example in APRALO, we had 18 individual members, and I would say 25% of that are people who are actually really engaged. So I wonder why the others actually have applied. So we may need to look at how we – who we're engaging [inaudible], and how we can get some performance metrics on our individual members as we do on our ALSes. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think we have this thing called the At-Large review going on. You may want to consider it within that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just maybe. The question I wanted to raise is, at this point, if I have been following things correctly, there was a consensus call on LACRALO, and I believe there were no negative comments. And I think the rules were if two ALSes objected, they would hold a vote. And I believe there were no objections whatsoever, but I'd like Silvia to verify this, in which case, LACRALO now officially has the concept of individual members. Silvia, did I miss something, or is that indeed the situation?

SILVIA VIVANCO: That's correct. I didn't see any objections to the individual membership.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't see an announcement saying the consensus call had passed.

SILVIA VIVANCO: No. That's right, the announcement has not been sent out yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So at this point, I think we can officially say all five RALOs have the concept of individual members. LACRALO is still in a position where they

have to discuss some details about it, and AFRALO is probably getting close to its two-year point where it has to discuss them again, but at this point, we now have individual members for all five RALOs, and I would like to ask for a hand of applause from everyone – virtual applause, anyway – in acknowledgement of that.

Before I go on, I see we have some hands from Alberto and Maritza, and Alberto put his hand down, but if either of those would like to speak, then please go ahead.

MARITZA AGUERO:

I just wanted to say that we proposed this amendment to subject this to a vote by all members of the community. There was a public comment period open until yesterday, and there have been no comments made. So, as a regional secretary, I'm about to send an e-mail to the mailing list informing all members of this achievement and this amendment, and the fact that there were no comments made.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Maritza. Did Alberto still want to speak? I guess not. The other question I have is we have a curious comment for AFRALO that we have been sitting, I think, for a while at two members and two observers with a comment saying observers may be requested to formally join as individuals. And I'm not quite sure of the process or the statuses. Anyone in AFRALO in a position to comment? I guess not. I will ask staff to look into that and perhaps report back to us via e-mail then. And as Cheryl has noted, at this point, we have finally completed the implementation of the first At-Large review.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And can I just say congratulations? I look forward to 2020 when the second ALAC review implementation may indeed be completed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, at this timeframe, it's not going to be completed until 2026, if we match the speed. For those of you who are younger than I am, something to look forward to for the next eight years.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, no, it won't. That's going to be over my cold, rotting corpse, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it may well be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, tell me about it. I realize that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Mine as well. Alright, thank you very much. And we'll go on to the next item, which is the closure of the At-Large review working party. Can I have confirmation from staff that we have quorum, that is at least eight ALAC members and all five regions represented? I will take silence as confirmation that everyone is represented, and I will ask staff to note who is on the call so we can record the outcome properly. And I will put the question.

You will recall that the At-Large working party was formed to oversee the implementation – not the implementation, the carrying out of the review up until we got to the implementation phase, and that is now completed. And the intent has always been to formally close this, and I am asking for [inaudible]

ANDREA GLANDON: Alan, we can hear you. You're very low right now. I'm not sure what changed, but you just –

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know. How am I right now?

ANDREA GLANDON: That's good. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Not much different, but I'll hold the phone very carefully. At this point, we need confirmation from staff that we have quorum, that is eight people and all regions represented.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So looking at the members here, I see 12 ALAC members, and there are definitely one from each region. In fact, the lowest is AFRALO with two [from each region.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Then I will ask you to note who is on the call, because we'll have to follow up with those who are not on the call to see if they wish to vote, and I'd like to call for a vote to abolish – to close the At-Large review working party. All documents and mailing lists will of course be preserved as they always are. And I ask, is there anyone who wishes to abstain from this vote?

I see no hands, I hear no voices. Alberto is a red – is a tick, but I don't think that means he wishes to abstain. Is there anyone who wishes to vote against closing the working group, the working party? Therefore, I will assume that everyone else, all 12 members who are on this call are voting to close the working party. I'll give people an opportunity to say I got it wrong. Alberto, please go ahead.

He says, "is okay," so okay, we do not have an issue. So at this point, 12 members have voted to close it. Staff will over the next two days verify with the other people whether they wish to vote and how they vote, and the vote will be recorded. At this point, we have 12 votes to close, that is a majority, and therefore the working party is closed with the thanks and appreciation of the ALAC, and certainly of the ALAC chair.

When we started that working party, no one believed the amount of work and effort we were going to have to put into it. So I certainly appreciate the effort that was put into it, and we did achieve our end and we are where we are today, implementing some recommendations that I believe are viable and will help the ALAC and At-Large and not hurt it, so I think we've done a good achievement, and I thank everyone and I hope we have the appreciation of everyone in the community.

Next item on the agenda is the EPDP, and I will give a moderately brief description of what's going on. There will be more discussed tomorrow on the CPWG, so if you have an interest in it, please tune in there. There will be more of an opportunity to both discuss and look at some of the results of the face-to-face meeting.

The group did meet for three days in Los Angeles last week. I must say I have participated in many meetings over my career, and I cannot remember as intense and hard a three days in my entire career. The days – it's not that they were so long. We worked from 8:30 until 5:30 or 6:00, which is not unusual, but the intensity and the amount of focus that one had to put into it, I thought, was just extraordinary.

It was an interesting meeting. It was facilitated by two facilitators, one some people on this call may know as David Plum who worked with the LACRALO mediation, and one other person from the same group. And I think we did significantly better because of that facilitation. It also caused a little bit of problems on occasion, but that's not surprising.

We sort of came to closure on a number of the critical issues, that is looking at the purpose for processing data and what the processing

actions were on a number of the critical issues. That's the really core part of the rationale to allow us to continue to use WHOIS in whatever way it finally ends up being used. But just collecting the data alone is a significant issue, and it was the largest single thing the data commissioners had identified, is we had not presented the case for why it is lawful, why it is necessary.

And so we did a lot of work on that. To be honest, some of that has unwound since then because there was a meeting this morning where it indicated that it's not clear that everyone supported the things, even the number of people who said they supported it. But going back for some steps is not all that unusual in this kind of process.

We will have a report out for, or just before or just after Brussels, which will try to lock in these various rationales for why we need to process data and what types of processing are allowed. And something that's far more obscure, who is the controller? Who accepts rules? And who implicitly has the legal liability?

The issue is a complex one, and it's complex partly because the law is complex, and partly because ICANN and WHOIS just does not fit the model that was being thought of when these laws were written. We are just so different in so many different ways that it's a hard fit. But the law is not likely to change on the short-term, so it is what it is.

There was a little bit of discussion with Göran Marby, specifically on the issue of liabilities, and to what extent can ICANN assume the liabilities from the contracted parties? And this is a really key issue for two reasons. Number one, it does reduce liabilities, and if contracted parties

stated receiving fines or orders to cease business, the whole concept of the domain business and how domains are used would really fall apart.

So none of us can afford to have that happen, either financially or conceptually. And on top of that, the concept of the – sorry, my mind has gone blank – access model that we’re talking about and we’ve been talking about significantly over the last few months, what ICANN is using the unified access model, what the BC and IPC are looking at in terms of their accreditation model, none of that’s going to work unless we can reduce liabilities of the contracted parties, because they’re not willing to take the risk of depending on some automated system to make some decisions for them which they may then have to pay a price for.

So it’s going to be an interesting time. How we’re going to get through it in time to meet the deadline is not clear, but interesting is all I can say. And I’ll turn it over to Hadia if she has anything to add. As I said, this is a brief summary, there will be more tomorrow. But if Hadia has anything to add, I’ll turn it over to her. And if not, Holly has her hand up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia, we cannot hear you. We hear a sound, but I can't make out what you're saying.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [inaudible]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hadia commented in the chat, "Okay, so you covered everything, Alan."

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry, I wasn't looking there. Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a comment. Some of the summaries that have come out, there's been a summary of the three-day meeting, which is actually very useful. So if people don't want to wade through three days of transcripts, some of the stuff that's come out is actually very useful. And I know that this'll be a session, or a couple, in Barcelona, but for people who want to prepare, some of this stuff is actually quite useful if people want to read it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Of course, the session in Barcelona will be two and a half weeks from now. We intend to have significant progress between now and then, so it will be different. I will be forwarding a number of these

documents to the CPWG list, and hopefully, everyone either is on one of the lists that will receive it or can go look at the archive if not.

HOLLY RAICHE:

And Heidi, thank you for the link.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any further comments on EPDP? Then we will go on to the next item, which is rules of procedure. You all should have received a message by now from me with a markup of the proposed changes to the rules of procedure and the e-mail guide, and I'm going to spend just a couple of minutes right now giving you a flavor for the kinds of things that are being proposed.

If people wish, we can have a dedicated conference call on this subject prior to Barcelona. There will be a bit of time allocated to this in Barcelona, but hopefully, if anyone has any concerns, they'll be raised well before that so we can address things. Most of the changes are not particularly consequential. They either are just corrections that had to be made or clarifications, or putting things in the rules that are part of our normal procedure now but have not been documented.

If we can put the document up, the rules of procedure, I'll go over just a few of them right now. There are one or two things that may be more interesting. I don't know if they'll be controversial, but they should be interesting. But let's look at the document first.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Is that the correct document, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, that's the correct document, I'm just trying to find a place where I put the interesting page numbers, and it seems to have disappeared somewhere on my desktop, unfortunately. But I'll fake it. Just give me a second to try to find that. There it is, okay. Skip to page two, you'll see really one of the more controversial changes.

The first, on top of the page is some reference to individual users. At these rules of procedure, although at that point one RALO had individual users, it wasn't common, and I tried to make the minimal number of changes which bring into focus that there are individual unaffiliated users in addition to ALSes. The wording may well need to be refined, but I don't think it's a controversial issue.

If we can go to the bottom of that page, you'll see another one of these really difficult ones. There we are. One of the consequences of the bylaw changes that went along with the IANA transition and accountability is they renumbered everything in the bylaws and they got rid of roman numerals and added a section early on, so you'll see article VI in roman numerals became article 6.13, became 7.13 in numeric numbers. I don't think that'll be a controversial change. Page six next. But it does show the ways these kind of rules can get out of date.

Here's very consequential changes. There were two items which had two punctuation marks at the end of them. I'm removing one of them. I hope no one will object. Next one is page eight to nine, bottom of page

eight. I don't know if you can scroll it so they sort of straddle the eight and nine so we see all of it. There it is.

This is an interesting one. Up until the new bylaws, chairs of ACs and SOs were simply chairs of the ACs and SOs. The interpretation varied depending on the AC and SO. For instance, I'm chair of ALAC, I'm not chair of At-Large. The GNSO chair of the GNSO council is also the chair of the GNSO. A fact that, by the way, surprised people in the GNSO, because that means they're in fact chair of the subgroups, the constituency and stakeholder groups. There was a heated discussion at one point saying, "No you're not," and unfortunately, that is what the bylaws say. So it's interesting.

But the chairs have never had a role in their own right. With the new bylaws, that's no longer the case. The new bylaws allocate to the chairs, but not their subservient, not their groups, the responsibility of selecting review team members. In other words, the review team like the RDS review or the ATRT3 that is likely coming up soon are selected by the group of chairs, not empowered community, because it's all seven chairs, not just the empowered community.

So this is a clause that simply says one of the responsibilities of the ALAC chair is to fulfill whatever responsibilities are given explicitly to the chair by the bylaws or by the board. The recent action on SSR2 to halt it and restart it was given again to the chairs. So this is simply acknowledging that. It has no impact on anything relating directly to ALAC or At-Large, but it does give an extra responsibility to the chair.

Page 16. And there we have – here's something. We had never done consensus calls on e-mail before, and that's become normal right now, and this is simply an acknowledgement that for consensus calls, all members are deemed to be present, and a lack of consensus is determined by our standard lack of consensus rule, that is the rule of thumb of 80%. So it simply acknowledges the fact that we're now doing something that wasn't common at the time these rules were originally put in place.

Page 18. And this is another one. We always had a clause saying ALAC meetings were open to anyone who wanted to participate. We never had a section of the bylaws of our rules of procedure that said ALT meetings are open. They always have been, but we never said it, and this simply acknowledges that fact.

And lastly – well, almost last, page 26. And – oops. Okay, that's fine. I'm not sure if that's the page I was aiming at, but that's good enough. That simply does a clarification on – this is determining the winner of the chair position, and there are some interesting possibilities that the criteria is if you have enough votes, then you win.

There is a situation that would happen for instance if a chair had 13 votes and there were two other candidates, each with one vote. If you read the procedures, it wasn't clear whether you were declared the winner because one person had more than half the votes, or you have to eliminate the bottom candidates first. And this simply said that if you have a winner, you have a winner, you don't have to follow any of the other obscure rules.

Scroll down a little bit, please. Alright. This is one where I provided two options, because I don't really know how to handle it, but there are two ways to proceed and we're looking for input as to which one is preferred. I don't think they matter a lot, but we do have to make a choice.

This is a situation again where you have three candidates and you have a tie for the bottom two, but the first candidate doesn't have enough to just win. Now, the question is, do you eliminate those bottom two and rerun the election with the one candidate and abstain to see if the candidate can get enough support, or do you rerun the whole thing?

And as I said, we need to make a decision. I provided both options. I don't have a strong preference, but it's one of those things that we need to decide. It was a situation that was never covered in the rules, and if we had had such a situation, it wouldn't be clear how we would have proceeded in that case. So this is just covering a hole in the rules.

And if we can go to page 30. Alright, there are two changes. This is the board selection procedure. One is to clarify that the expressions of interest or a subset of them should be published to allow the electorate to look at what the expression of interest was for the candidates they're voting on.

There is also a petition process which says RALO under some conditions can petition [that another one] of the candidates who were not selected be put onto the ballot, and this is saying that if the RALOs are going to make that decision, they need to have their expressions of interest published so the RALOs can look at it.

Maureen raised an interesting issue of what if a candidate doesn't want their information published if they aren't selected, and I think that we could accommodate that easily. I didn't think of it when I was drafting it, but it's something that could be accommodated easily enough.

And the second section on that page is the petition process that there's been some discussion on exactly what was the intent of the petition process. And the original intent was if three RALOs feel very passionate that the BCEC made a mistake – remember, the BCEC is made up of people selected by the RALOs, but if they believe passionately that the BC made a mistake, then they can add a candidate on. But the exact process was not clear, and this is suggesting a process going forward. And this is one of the ones there may be some discussion on about different views on how to handle it. It's probably the only controversial one, or semi-controversial.

So, I ask everyone to look over these changes carefully. If you don't feel comfortable with them, then raise the issue. Let's start on e-mail, and if anyone feels we really want a webinar to go over them in detail, we can certainly do that. There are some other changes to the ALAC e-mail guide. All of them are simply putting in place what we are doing as a matter of practice right now, so I don't think any of those will be controversial, but take a look at those too. Let's make sure we get it right.

There is a three-week warning period that has to be given to allow the rules to be changed, and this, since they were distributed today, the three weeks expires on the Tuesday of the ICANN meeting, and we intend at this point to hold a vote on the Wednesday to approve this or

to approve however they evolve over the next three weeks if there are any changes.

And that is all I have to say, unless anyone has something compelling. I don't really want this to be a debate over the details, but I wanted to just give you a heads up and make sure everyone is familiar with what we're doing. So I'll open the floor for a moment, but hopefully, there isn't anything that we need to discuss. We are a little bit behind time. No, we're actually just about on time right now.

Alright, the next item on the agenda is update of the At-Large review on the At-Large review implementation, and I'll turn it over to Maureen and/or Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I was just unmuting my phone. Yes, okay. [So on there.] Okay, now, the At-Large review implementation working group, the group itself is – of active participants is actually growing. I'm quite pleased. But I must admit we don't seem to be engaging some of the people who are actually on the list, so the official list that was drawn up. I'd really like to get more participants from that group.

And also, just reminding people that the development of this particular activity is focusing on the steps for the board-approved proposal that –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: One minute remaining.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's not worry about it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, so it's focusing on the steps of the board-approved proposals. That's our first priority. So, I think that we need to keep that in focus, but still continue to put your ideas forward.

Just moving to the [plan] development table, if you had a look at it, it's like two main workspaces that we've got at the moment, and one's got the [plan] development. That's sort a progress sheet and information about the participants in each of the issues teams have put on there, plus any information that we get about progress and how [that's doing.] So every time we have a working group meeting, we'll update progress as it happens.

The focus of the three weeks since our last meeting, we decided that we would give the team three weeks, which takes us up until Barcelona, time to put together the draft of the steps that they were going to – that we can discuss in Barcelona.

So the prioritization and dependencies workspace is just that, it's a place where we can actually put our ideas. I must submit my apologies to those issue leaders who only just got connected to the mailing list. I hope we sent out the messages that I sent out earlier before [inaudible]. And I hope that they will be able to move ahead now with the teams that they're actually working with.

I do acknowledge that the issues leaders, team leaders, are basically ALAC and other – sort of my thought leaders within my group of people who are working on various activities within At-Large. They basically were voluntold rather than volunteered. But I do think it's important that we do engage as many of our leaders within At-Large, because [it's just good] to have everyone's buy-in in order for us to move forward with this.

Our next meeting is going to be on the 9th of October, and everyone's invited to attend so we can [give an] update. And also, we may be able to start on looking at some of those steps and [inaudible] discussions about them, which we're going to be doing in Barcelona with others. Thank you. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that all sounds like a damn good plan to be, Maureen. Not much I need to say.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Any questions? Oh, well, do come along to the meeting on the 9th of October. Thank you. Thank you, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Any comments from anyone else? This is marvelous, people are giving little descriptions of telling you what's going on, and no one has any questions. So they're doing it clearly perfectly.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [I will get lots of e-mails.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's see if we can continue this. The next item on the agenda is ATLAS III. Who is going to speak on behalf of ATLAS III?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I can talk about ATLAS III a little bit.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Actually, before you talk about it, I will point out in case any of you missed the e-mail from a couple of weeks ago, the chair of all ACs and SOs has an opportunity to talk to the CEO prior to the meeting. We had a little conference call going, and this time, it was me and of course Maureen as the incoming chair. And one of the issues we raised is just how are we going to start planning for ATLAS III, and how are the Meetings team going to reserve rooms if we don't have any budget?

And he said he'll take it to the board. And he was going to take it to the board at a workshop in Brussels. He in fact took it to the board the next week without waiting for the workshop and got approval. So the

Meetings team is reserving rooms for us, and we can start doing our detailed planning.

Of course, everything could fall apart at the last moment if we end up in an absolutely disastrous financial situation, but nothing in life is absolutely certain. But at this point, we believe we will be funded to a significant effect. I believe they said in the letter that we should plan on not exceeding \$400,000, and I suspect we may come in a bit below that. So now we have a job to actually make it happen. And back to Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. Yes, nothing too great to report at this particular stage because we had been focusing on the logistics side of things, and that's as soon as we got the okay from the board, of course, we naturally jumped in to give information back to the meetings team, which is – who were waiting on information about what we might do. And at that particular point in time, [inaudible] yes, what are we going to do?

But we've got Gisella working on that side of things, and I'd like Gisella – is she here? Is Gisella on the line?

ALAN GREENBERG:

She should be.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Maureen, yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, good. Gisella, could you just give a little overview on what we're going to do in Montréal? I mean logistics-wise, venue-wise.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Maureen. We are actually in the process of putting together a draft schedule of the ATLAS III, just the main meeting rooms which will be required in Montréal, and we're working closely with Meetings team on this. Obviously, the high-interest topics, cross-community sessions, the timings of those sessions and also the number of those sessions, as it has varied at the last two AGMs, will also impact our scheduling.

So we will have already confirmed with Meetings team the number of meeting rooms we'll be requiring, as in the large room for those who were in London for the plenary sessions, and then we will be using the large room as well as three smaller rooms for the breakout sessions, and that is all work in progress, and hopefully, we'll have something by the end of this week. I actually have this call with Meetings team which has been postponed until tomorrow to make sure that we're all working on the same page, and more specifically on the same block schedule to make it as accurate as possible at this stage.

And again, this is only placing our meetings, this has nothing to do with actual content. This is purely for logistical purposes to make sure that we've got the conference rooms we needed as well as interpretation facilities.

With regards to the external networking event, the idea there – and I believe it has been a very good suggestion – from Meetings team is to hold it at a hotel nearby, as all the hotels are linked – well, most of the

hotels are linked with the conference center via underground passages, which means that we don't have to go outside as the temperatures in Montréal will be fairly low. So we're also working on that with Meetings team to find which would be the most suitable venue.

And then I'd say that the rest is going to be work in progress as we put the teams together, and thank you for that, and I'll hand it back to Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: thank you, Gisella. Yes, moving on to the content, Olivier Crépin-Leblond is a co-chair with me, and he's in charge of the program. And I know that he's made a start on it, but Olivier, could you just give an update on where you're at and how you plan to be moving forward with this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. We're at very early stage. First, can you hear me properly? Because I was very faint earlier.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Clearly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Clearly? Okay. Excellent. That's good news, at least one thing. So, we're still at very early stage. We're looking at, as you heard from Gisella, a number of plenary sessions and a number of workshops or breakout

workshops where we will have the whole number of participants that will basically be divided into several teams. We have not yet looked at the topics or looked at sort of a detailed breakdown of the program.

Currently working on this are Eduardo Diaz, Maureen, and myself. A couple of other people have joined up, they're interested in this topic. If you're interested in putting together the program for this, then please, step forward and volunteer, and then we'll add you to the team. But we're still at very early stage.

What's absolutely clear is that there's going to be less people, as you've heard from Alan. There's going to be less people than in the previous meeting, so the groups are going to be smaller, and there's likely to be some drafting. And of course, what we're probably going to do is to do the same thing as in London in that we're going to do some preparation work before the meeting takes place.

So expect to hear more, and as I said, if you want to get involved, please join us.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Olivier. Okay, well, just before I go to the speaking queue, I just wanted to mention that one of the things that we'll be looking in more depth is the criteria for selection. There are some metrics that have been mentioned on the prioritization and dependencies template number [15,] and there had been concerns raised.

And that's great, because we do need [inaudible] draft and we need to talk about those sorts of things. But the metrics for the criteria for

selection is something that we're going to have to work on, remembering we can only take 60 people. So we have to make sure that we choose the best 60, because it's going to be, as Olivier mentioned, there's going to be quite a lot of work that's going to be involved before, during and after this event.

So the selection will probably be created by a group, a small – well ,not too big a group, but that represents the ATLAS organizing group that we will be forming. The ATLAS implementation group, that is, I think it's number 11. And –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: 16, thank you. Number 16, which is the metrics implementation group. So that we're actually getting sort of like a cross-section of those areas when we're actually looking at that particular criteria. Okay, so Alan's first in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll just point out we allocated five minutes for this talk, so we are running a little bit over. Two comments. Number one, on the selection, this is tightly coupled to the At-Large review. It's not a part of the review, but it's coupled to it in that we basically said in our statement to the board that for meetings like this, we are going to be bringing people who are actively involved in policy or that we think are

good candidates for that, that is exposing them to ICANN hopefully will give them enough understanding so they can be active.

So we really are looking at workers at this point, and the numbers alone make it clear that we're not doing one per ALS or something like that. Working counts, and it's going to be interesting if when we develop the right metrics, we find out there are three people from one ALS or four individual members from a RALO that are very active, and none from other ones. We're going to make some hard decisions.

The other comment I'll make is the difficulty we're going to have in arranging our schedule. For the first two atlases, ICANN meetings at that point were – I'll make hopefully a humorous comment – rather boring. The format of ICANN meetings had not changed for years.

The weekend before an ICANN meeting, ACs and SOs might do some work, and on Tuesday, [we have] constituency day, and all the rest of the sessions other than the open forums were basically – will compete against each other and see what happens.

Now we have a rather different process of deciding how the meeting week looks and when there are high-interest sessions and cross-community sessions. And the formatting of the week is very different than it was before and doesn't get settled until close in before the meeting. We're challenged to set up what the ATLAS meetings are going to be, not knowing what's going to be happening in Montréal a year from now in terms of exactly which days will we have what kinds of meetings on. So it's going to be a real challenge, and I'm glad I'm not going to be actively involved in that process. Thank you. Maureen, back

to handle the queue, and if we can try to keep it a little bit short, because we still do have discussions of ICANN 63 to do.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thank you. We've got Tijani next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Maureen. I understood from the logistic preparation that you will have only three subgroups or three topics to be discussed, or perhaps four with the large room. I don't know if large room would be available for us all the time. Is it a decision – because we cannot decide on this before preparing the program, so I don't know how it was done. Second question, I heard about 60 or 16 people. I don't know you are speaking about people who attend the summit or people who will prepare the summit. So please explain me. I didn't understand. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Tijani, the room allocations were – we had to make a decision about what might be sort of the most appropriate room allocation for us to use, and the large room, which is the ALAC room, will always be available for us during – well, not always, there'll be other people using it as well, but the main sessions for our [time,] we will have access to that room. And the three other rooms are if we need to.

The program has not been organized yet, as Olivier mentioned. It's still very much in a very preparatory stage. But the number of people that we will be taking is 60, 60 that we will be able to accommodate within

the funding that we've got, as well as the other expenses that will be required for the venue and the catering and all that kind of stuff. So yeah, it is 60. Is that okay? Alan, [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: That's 60 in addition to the normal 30 travelers that we have going to every meeting.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, exactly. Was that it, Alan? Can you put your hand down so I can ask Sébastien?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sorry. You can ask him even if I don't put my hand down.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Maureen. Yeah, I want to come back to this, because I really think that, yes, we are pleased that we will have a so-called ATLAS III, but it will not be ATLAS. It will be just a small meeting. We are treated very badly regarding when you compare it with what is done for GAC and for others.

But nevertheless, okay, better to have this small ATLAS than nothing, but I am very concerned with the number. The idea when we pushed

the idea of atlas was to have at least once every once upon a time, but it was then decided once each five years to have each and every ALS with real participants to come.

And here we have figures before we know how many, and at the same time, we try to have more and more ALSes. And it's totally in contradiction. That's the first point.

The second, I didn't see any, but I didn't read all my e-mail, maybe an appeal for a candidate to participate to this ATLAS preparation. And the third point, and you already hear me saying that I guess it's important to contact directly the ALSes who are in Quebec and in Montréal to participate to this work. I am sure that it will be a good way to have them included. And maybe they could participate in addition to the 60 and in addition to the 30. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Sébastien. I know that – it's sort of like last September when we actually got the okay from the board, and it's required us to speed things up with making sure that we've got the venue situation sorted.

So we're only just starting now on getting together some programming kind of activities, and the working group will actually be formed as soon as we get ourselves organized. And this is being done at the same time of course as the pressure that [we're] putting on ourselves with regards to the implementation activities.

So there's a little bit of a crossover in a lot of [that.] I've already mentioned that the [inaudible] situation was an issue on the ATLAS,

there was an issue on the involvement of – regional involvement of participants in the actual meeting itself [inaudible] become involved.

But I think when we're talking about the 60, we're looking at selecting people, and [that's funded.] And when we put the application to Göran and the board, we actually had to come up with a number that we felt that the board would feel comfortable supporting with funding, and they agreed on the 60, and they came up with an amount.

So we do have to – it's probably not – because we're used to sort of having lots of money around and being able to invite who we liked, but I think the situation's very much changed for ICANN now. So we have to make the most of it, we have to show that actually, what we end up with [from] this event is going to add value to our work within ICANN ,and that's what we've got to show first of all. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Maureen. Just two things. First on the number. Yes, it is indeed 60, so 60, please the 30 or so people in At-Large. So we're looking really at 90 people. In response to Tijani's question whether there would be three groups or four groups, since we do have the main room, it would be four for the very simple reason that with four groups, you've got about 23 people to manage in the group.

With three, it goes up to 30, and as you know, the groups are not even, so some groups might be larger than others. And so basically, at that point, it's not a working group anymore when you've got that many people. It's [inaudible] a lecture or a presentation. And then we just get

ten that are doing something and the rest have just turned themselves off because they're way too far from the speaker, etc.

So that's the thing. Gisella is [firmly] in charge of all the room bookings and things, she's already looked at the conference center and how things are arranged over there, so a lot of the way that we organize things is going to be dictated by the space that we have and by the local facilities as such.

And regarding a call for participants, Maureen [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD:

You would definitely be starting that pretty shortly, [inaudible]. Okay. Yeah, okay, so we'll finish there then, Alan, seeing as you want to hurry on. But if there are any questions or queries, send them to me. I'm happy to deal with them .Ty.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And there's going to be lots of work being done, so – excuse me. Anyone eager to participate, I think everyone is welcome. The next topic is ICANN 63, and I will turn it over to Gisella and/or Heidi to take us through that.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Alan. I'll start if you don't mind, Heidi. So, the countdown has started, we're only 17 days away from the meeting. As we say, it is really just around the corner. I hope that all the funded travelers have confirmed their itineraries and are all set to attend the ICANN meeting

in Barcelona. If, however, there are any issues with the funded travelers, please do contact me directly and I'll make sure that we deal with this in a timely manner.

The ICANN 63 schedule has been published. I will now be putting the link in the Adobe Connect room. And I will also send this around on the ALAC announce list to make sure that everyone can see the – sorry, Andrea, thank you very much for putting it there – to make sure that everyone can already have a look at the main schedule and see what is happening in Barcelona.

We have our ICANN 63 Wiki page with all the main meetings on it as well as all the useful information, and this is also what we call the one stop shop for everyone to please use, especially when we're on the ground in Barcelona and for those attending remotely. This does have the most updated version of the At-Large agendas.

This is still work in progress, so again, as soon as the At-Large schedule is finalized, we'll be sending an e-mail out with this link to make sure that everyone is prepared and is able to bookmark it on their computer.

This meeting is yet again very busy, especially on day one on Saturday, that is the 20th of October. We have two conflicting sessions with the ALAC, that is the EPDP and the new gTLD subsequent procedures. And with this in mind, we've started working on the At-Large schedule to accommodate [these] conflicts. I'll let Heidi take us through the daily agendas. And Olivier, would you already like to say a few words on the joint outreach event on Monday, the 22nd of October?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Gisella. So as you know, or as you might not know, there's a joint outreach event that takes place from 10:30 AM until 12:00, and then 12:15 to 1:15 in the afternoon. It's in two parts. It's going to be very open. Our target group really are the newcomers, so you're looking at the fellows, we're looking at the NextGen, and anybody else who wishes to learn a thing or two.

Of course, most of you are already well knowledgeable about policy and about topics that we will be talking about. If you asked us what topics are we going to talk about, well, we have no clue, because the idea is to actually try and get the people who come in the room to tell us what they're particularly interested in, if they have any questions and so on.

So, we're doing it a bit different this time from previous times, where previous times, we had chosen some topics and said, right, we're going to talk about this and that, and sometimes, the fellows in particular had already been briefed about this heavily before coming to us and just ended up falling asleep. On this occasion, we'll say, "What have you not learned about? What do you not know?"

Now, it might be difficult to not know what you don't know, but maybe we'll tell them, "What do you know?" And then we'll avoid that and talk about everything else. It's a bit experimental, but hopefully, it's going to be fun for everyone, and we'll have hopefully a lot of people coming over.

We need a number of good people from At-Large. I know Alan has been working with staff to make sure both sessions don't clash all with the

same people. I'm sure there will be some conflicts for some people, but as you know, it's open, so you can come in and come out.

Do not expect to have a seat at the table though if you're an expert. What we're hoping this time is to get the fellows and the NextGen at the table and everyone else to revolve around them. Yeah, you should be worried if they start taking flyswatters and start chasing you around. But yeah, hopefully, it will be fun, and it'll be helpful for the people that are there. Thanks.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you very much, Olivier. The main social events – sorry, coming back to the agendas, Heidi will take us through this, so I'm just going to touch base again on the main social events at the ICANN 63 meeting.

On Monday, we have [Jens] performing. I believe this will be at a location somewhere central in Barcelona, but we will keep you posted. And on Wednesday the 24th, we have the gala evening. This will take place at the venue, and there will be tickets available at the booth. But again, all this information will be sent around to everybody. You may see that what I've put up in the Adobe Connect room for those of you who are on the Adobe Connect room is the joint NCUC and At-Large outreach event. So hopefully, many will be joining us there.

I'd also like to point out that we're celebrating the 20th anniversary of ICANN. There will be a session on Thursday the 25th in the afternoon, from 5:00 to 6:00 PM, followed by the ICANN 20th anniversary cocktail, which will also be the closing cocktail. So at this stage, I'd like to hand it

over to Heidi to take us through the daily agendas, unless there are any questions.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I see a couple of hands up, but those may be old hands. Tijani and Olivier.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's not old.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Alan, I hand the call back to you, and Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's a new hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I'd like to express my sadness that Seun Ojedeji will not be able to make it because of visa issue. Seun said and repeated that he wasn't helped by Constituency Travel to get his visa. He also said that they advised him not to apply again from another embassy, because you know, Schengen, you can apply from any country from Schengen. So Seun will be absent, and I am sad for that, and I hope that in the future, we will not have such case. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Just confirming that [Jens] will be playing at the Hard Rock Café. You've just heard from Gisella that the – I think she mentioned it, that the gala will take place in the venue – which, by the way, is not the most exciting of places in Barcelona. Quite far from it, in fact. And so, well, the Hard Rock Café is in one of the exciting parts of Barcelona, [and it is] not just around the corner. So you can find your way there. There is public transport to get there, and you can also share whatever ridesharing there is around and so on. That was one thing.

The other thing was the question regarding logistics. On the ICANN website – so now I go from telling you things to actually trying to find out something – all it talks about going from the airport to the venue is either by taxi or using one of the most expensive chauffeur-driven limo service that you can think of, and I think that it's not even one per diem, I think it's tow per diems, so you need to have two people not eating the whole day to actually be able to get to the hotel. Isn't there a chance of getting instructions on how to get there by public transport or cheaper ways than this? Because right now, [inaudible]. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier – if I may, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Noted regarding public transport and other means of transport to get to the conference center. I'll pick up on this and send the note out. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I think it's also going to be important to try to get people who are arriving at the same time to work together.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will note that as Olivier noted, the convention center and hotels are not in the city center. They're at the other side of the city from where the airport is, so it's going to be challenging. Some of us who have tight connections leaving may be interesting also. Although we thought we were going to be able to stay for the last events on whatever day you're leaving, that may not be the case if traffic – I'm assuming there is traffic in Barcelona. Just a wild guess on my part.

Anyone else have any further comments before I turn it back to whoever I'm turning it back to?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I see Olivier's hand up. [But I think that's] an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's an old hand.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Okay, so I have [posted] the link to the Saturday sessions, and I'm going to review these very quickly. Saturday –

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, Heidi, before you do, let's give a little bit of an intro. Saturday's sessions, there are a significant number of people not going to be there because of involvement with the GNSO subsequent procedures or the EPDP. So we're trying to put things on Saturday which a subset of At-Large can benefit from. The Sunday and Tuesday sessions, where the bulk of our other sessions are, are nominally allocated and what Heidi's going to be talking about.

As you'll see, there are significant gaps still there. We have opportunity to add new subjects or expand the ones we have, and of course, things may well move around. So exactly which session they're in today does not mean that's where they're going to be by the time we get there. But this is a good first cut. Heidi, back to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Thank you. I was just about to say that, but thank you very much. So again, I'll just go through the At-Large, the ALAC and regional leaders

sessions, and on the Saturday, as we noted, some of you will not be there. Alan, for example, Cheryl, etc. So we're going to move some of the regional sessions to that Saturday.

First thing in the morning will be a welcome and introduction for our new ALAC members and those others that are new incoming leaders. Then we'll have a review of the main topics and aims of ICANN 63, including the schedule, discuss housekeeping at the end, then we'll move on to inviting Xavier and Mary Wong to talk about the fiscal year 20 budget, including the additional budget requests, and followed by a 30-minute presentation by Krista Papac who is the ICANN complaints officer, leading into the afternoon, which is – I believe it starts at 13:30. That's the At-Large regional leaders meeting. Olivier is leading that, and the agenda will be determined later this week, I believe.

Part three, the ALAC regional leaders session will be dedicate to the ALAC subcommittee on outreach and engagement, so we'll be working with Daniel and the co-chairs for the agenda. The session four will be with Tijani on the capacity building topic, then [sort of flowing,] the idea would be to invite Sally Costerton, just her, not her regional VPs this time, to talk about GSE issues and collaborations with At-Large. And then again, connected to that will be just 15 minutes with the Public Responsibility Support, including the ICANN Learn, which might link to some of the work that's being planned for ATLAS III. So that's Saturday, a busy day, and then we can have networking starting at 18:30.

Sunday will be a series of sessions focused on some of the big projects At-Large is working on, including the At-Large implementation in the

morning, then outreach and engagement. For those who missed that session on the Saturday, there'll be a brief update for that.

That'll then flow into the second project of ATLAS III planning. Again, the focus of ATLAS III will be on the At-Large review implementation, so that hopefully will be an ice segue. Then we'll be meeting with SSAC for 45 minutes.

Now, this kind of brings us to our first session that is completely open, and I noted that we have in total, currently, approximately two hours open. So there is time, we are fortunate with that to have some time to bring up other issues, so please do let Alan and ICANN 63 prep group know. And we then move on to a two-part session on CPWG, the first one being a general introduction, and then a focused discussion. I'm assuming it's going to be EPDP issues on the others.

Then, session – I believe this is six or so of the ALAC regional leaders working session will be RSSAC, and then we'll invite Brian Gutterman who is the manager for Registrant Services. There's a new report that they would like to present to you for your feedback. And then we have Anna Neves who is the GAC liaison to the ALAC. She'll be speaking with us, and there's an opportunity for you to ask her any questions.

Then in the afternoon, the final session of the day is with the ccNSO, and you can see there's an agenda ready to go. Just [going to] see if there's comments there. Okay. So then Monday will be busy with other activities. There'll be some At-Large RALO sessions, the outreach session as Olivier mentioned, but for the most part, there'll be no ALAC meetings.

So moving on to Tuesday, we have another ALAC and regional working session. This is now [prep.] Both of them, both items currently are for [prep,] one for the ALAC board, one for the meeting with the GAC, and there is some time available for that session.

There'll be a full session on – well, considerable session on EPDP, as well as additional policies, and then we have a working lunch with Maureen on the next steps, which will allow her some time to discuss and to have an introduction to her thoughts and her plans for the ALAC.

And then we have to move somewhat quickly to the GAC, and there's a meeting with the GAC between 14:15 and 15:00. The agenda is set for that. And then again in the afternoon, there is a wide-open session, so feel free, again, to mention some topics. And then there'll be the last item of the day there, is the ALAC meeting with the NCSG.

Which brings us to Wednesday, and this is our time with the board. And currently, that is first thing in the morning, 8:30 to 9:30, and we'll get to [issues of the questions] in just a moment. But then we have two wrap-ups in the afternoon, the first one being ALAC action, any votes.

There is 30 minutes dedicated to the ROP review, as Alan mentioned earlier, and then 30 minutes for brief reports from the liaisons, RALO chairs and working group chairs. Then, the last At-Large session, and Alan's last meeting as ALAC chair, will be the wrap-up two. It will have discussions with León, with Göran and David Olive, as well as a chair's announcement, which might be Maureen or myself announcing issues, actually, and then followed by the EURALO general assembly for 90 minutes in the afternoon, followed, as Gisella mentioned, by the gala.

And that brings us to Thursday, and again, this is where we do have more ICANN-related events, we have the AGM meeting and the ICANN board. We have the ICANN community recognition program. If you are [leaving a position,] please do go to that session.

And then we'll have a number of high-interest topics and public forums, followed, as Gisella mentioned, by the ICANN at 20 years event, and the 20 years cocktail. And that is it. I'm going to hand over to Maureen, Alan, if that's okay. She's going to take over from then, including the development session on the Friday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Yes, sorry, I'm unmuting my phone. I keep forgetting. Okay, just going very briefly, [inaudible] a bit of a slight change, because I've actually been offered this extra time, but it will give me some time to look at the org anagram, the organizational model for At-Large, and actually really discussing it with everyone about roles and responsibilities and how we mean to move on with that.

Or else we may – I haven't worked it out, we will finalize this, but we could actually use that other time for some brief reports so that we can

actually get some of the working groups that are actually being formed and getting some direction with regards to those working groups.

But I think most of the time, we'll probably – apart from probably some future navel gazing probably – looking at how [inaudible] proceed during the next year. And then some major time on the implementation plans [inaudible]. Because while we're together, I really think it's important that we have that opportunity to talk about how we aim to do what needs to be done with this to actually give it the greatest effect that we can give in our report to the board, because they'll be very interested in what we're going to be doing.

Is there a comment? Are there any questions or queries, or have I got [inaudible] Okay, so my focus [will] actually be some introductory activities, but I'd really like to get on to the implementation. I [inaudible] say that we're actually – as I said, I really want everybody on the same page when we're going through these, because what results from it will really set the scene for how we move on together for the rest of the year, and making those plans. Thank you. Who's next?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Maureen. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry, my Adobe Connect is not operating very well right now. My chat is frozen, and I don't see any hands. So if there are any hands, please tell me.

GISELLA GRUBER: No hands.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Is there anything else that we need to discuss? I've lost track. Have we talked about board questions?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan. I was on mute, but yes, that is already – I've just put the page into the chat, and it's being loaded. So currently, we have one question to the board from the ALAC. We do have the board questions already, but as I noted, there'll be some time to prepare for those, the responses to those during the meeting itself.

So what I really do need today, since the deadline was yesterday, is to confirm the ALAC questions to the board.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'll take it since I'm the one who posed it. Essentially, the question is one that has come up in ALAC and At-Large repeatedly over the last decade regarding new gTLDs, and that is, do we need them? The concern is augmented now in this austerity period in that the original concept of the new gTLDs is that the cost recovery is that the application process would be cost recovery, and there was envisioned a remarkably large update of these new gTLDs, and therefore, the operating revenue from domain sales, the part that comes to ICANN from registrars and registries would readily cover all of our other expenses and all sorts of growth.

The reality has been that there has not been the kind of sales of domains that was originally projected, but the operating cost, and particularly things like GDD to support the interactions with these groups, and Contractual Compliance, it's not clear to what extent these are well-funded from those revenues [or not.]

So this is really asking the question, can we afford to have new gTLDs? If there are costs associated with them that may not be borne by the operating costs, how do we handle that? Do we really understand the benefits? And of course, a lot of this comes back to the CCT Review Team report that was just published.

And so the question is, the PDP is doing a really good job at looking at the specific questions associated with the application process and making new gTLDs available. And I think the community is doing well in trying to evaluate those and come to some common ground that matches the needs of the various parts of the community. But who's standing back and looking at the overall picture? And the PDP is not charged with that, but the board is, so I think it's a fair question to ask them. And I'll wait for comments.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, I agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: And there aren't any. Is there anyone who has something else they feel would want to add to the board questions? In the past, we've added things at the last moment, and sometimes, the board has responded,

but I don't think we can count on it. I see Heidi has her hand up. I don't know if that's in response to my question or not.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, just a suggestion, and you might want to do this in meetings with others, but perhaps just a short summary of where At-Large is with the planning of ATLAS, what they are planning at this stage. I know it's early days, but just a broad overview, and perhaps just some thoughts to invite them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi, I think there's ample opportunity for us to cover that on the – their question is what are our priorities for this year. And if ATLAS and the At-Large review are not our priorities for this year, and EPDP, I don't know what are. So yes, I think that that is something we should do, but it's already readily covered under their question to us. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you. Why would we speak to them about the ATLAS? For them to tell us, "Oh, great that you're spending our money?" No. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I think it is one of the things we're working on, and we may choose to mention it. How much we want to focus on it is an interesting question, and I think your point may well be taken. And I think we have

to consider that. Anyone else? Then back to Heidi or Gisella. Are there any other subjects related to this that we have not addressed? I'm expecting we're going to see a large influx of questions for Göran.

Last time, unusually, when we posed the question of with what should we ask the CEO, we got a large number of comments back, and those were consolidated into a number of questions, and he actually came and answered them. So if anyone has anything they'd like to ask this time – maybe you now know everything and have no more questions. We don't have a formal deadline, at least I haven't been told of a formal deadline, but it's a nice touch if we can get him the questions well before the meeting. Heidi is probably going to push for that for various reasons.

So if anyone has any questions to ask the CEO – remembering of course that the CEO does not make the decisions on behalf of the organization, the board does that, but he has to carry them out – then please feel free. And I see no hands. I do see a hand now from Olivier. Please go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. During a recent call of the regional leaders, the regional chairs and Göran Marby – because, yes, we were able to talk to him too – Eduardo Diaz came up with a very good question, is, what happens if the EPDP doesn't come to find a solution for the GDPR.

And he expanded to some extent, but I think it would be interesting if the ALAC was to ask him this and for him to share his views. Thank you.

And I'm not going to tell you what he answered, because otherwise, you'll know and you won't talk about it. So that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, someone may choose to ask that question then now that you've given them the wording. I think as interesting as that is is what is ICANN looking at to try and facilitate addressing EPDP. I also know the answer to that question, but it's a really interesting answer, and I think it's [still] a question worth asking. Or you can just ask me and I'll tell you the answer, and we have nothing to discuss with him. Your call.

I'm being rather flippant. This is the last minutes of my last meeting as ALAC chair on an ALAC meeting, so I'm allowed. We do have five minutes before the end of the meeting. I pride myself on ending meetings on time. Is there anything else we need to discuss regarding ICANN 63?

Then I will ask, is there anything in the chat being said that I need to factor in? As I said, Adobe Connect is celebrating by making sure I can't use Adobe Connect anymore. I can actually see what's going on, although it's delayed, but I cannot type anything into any answers. So if anyone has sent me any messages and you expected me to answer, I'll answer you on Skype. Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, it is, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then please go ahead. Once we complete ICANN 63, we will open Any Other Business if there is any. But go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, no, I was going to speak to Any Other Business.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Is there anything further on ICANN 63? Then we will close that item and we'll open Any Other Business. We had not had any requests, but I see we have a hand from Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. Of course, there's still four minutes left of the call, and if I manage to filibuster for five minutes, you will be late on the last call that you are finishing [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if it is anyone who knows how to have a call run over, it's you. I'll let you do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Of course. That's why I want to share the knowledge. No, I was just going to say, Alan, just to thank you for having run those calls for four years. I know what it feels like. I also know what it feels like to be an ex-chair and sometimes being told that you have to shut up. And unfortunately, [I'm] hard work for the chairs that come afterwards.

But I wanted to thank you, really, for what you've done. And you're going to be an ex-chair as well. I'm sure you're going to be put to work by the next chair, as you very well did with me. So just a round of applause for you is, I think, what you deserve at this point in time. And I guess I can't ramble on for another three minutes, so against all my wishes, you're going to be on time yet again. Thanks, Alan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But he doesn't escape you [anyway,] Olivier. He just gets to join the club more officially. Welcome.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not quite there yet, I still have a couple more days of work to do. And as you can see with the rules of procedure, I'm trying to fill them as well as I can. Well, I'm going to say other words when we get to Barcelona, but since this is my last ALAC call – and I don't know how many of these I've chaired, I'm guessing we probably have about nine of them a year, excluding the ICANN meeting, so this is probably somewhere around 36. Maybe 35, maybe 37.

It's been interesting. I've learned an awful lot, both from everyone and with everyone. And I look forward to seeing what the next steps are. But for the moment, I will not only adjourn this meeting, which I've been told is not the right word, I will end it, and I will end the last ALAC meeting of my career as chair. Thank you all for participating.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: It's great turnout at this meeting, and look forward to seeing you all in Barcelona. I get on my plane in – well, I leave for the airport exactly two weeks from today right now, or I'll miss it if I don't get in the car right now. So I look forward to working with you over the next two weeks and see you in Barcelona in a few days after that. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] Bye for now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, everyone.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, everyone. The meeting has been adjourned, and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call, and please do remember to disconnect your audio. Thank you, and have a good rest of your day, morning, or afternoon. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]