

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team call on Tuesday, 2 October 2018, at 18:30 UTC.

On the call today, we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Andrei Kolesnikov, Yrjö Lansipuro, Alfredo Calderon, Eduardo Diaz, John Laprise, and Ejikeme Egbuogu.

We have received apologies from Seun Ojedeji, Bastiaan Goslings, and Bartlett Morgan.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Evin Erdogdu, Yeşim Nazlar, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes.

With this, I turn it over to you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Since the ALAC call is just a little while after this one, we're going to do our best to not replicate things and that is not have simply outgoing discussions presenting things that are going to be presented on the next meeting as well. For all the sections, we're going to try to focus on things that need the explicit attention of the ALT prior to the meeting or will not be presented in the follow on meeting. So I ask everyone as their turn comes around to try to do that. With any

---

*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.*

---

luck, this meeting will be a lot shorter than an hour and a half because of that, but I've learned to stop making real predictions like that.

The first item is policy development. On this one, I'd like to try to make decisions so that we can recommend a path forward on the ALAC meeting. So this one we will be going through to review the current status and make sure we understand where things are. Evin, I'll turn it over to you. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Alan. On the agenda, you can see there were three statements ratified by the ALAC this month and statements in process underneath. Currently there's a vote on the Initial Report on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures. It will close later today or tonight, depending on where you are in the world.

We have a statement draft posted for the next comment, ICANN Seeking Community Feedback on the Proposed Unified Access Model by Greg Shatan. He's working on an update in advance of a CPWG call tomorrow.

Alan Greenberg as penholder has posted a draft for the Next Steps on Reviews public comment, which was just sent out today for comment. Comments will close on the 4<sup>th</sup> so that there's time to update the draft if need be by submission on the 5<sup>th</sup>.

The fourth public comment that's currently in draft mode is the Proposed gTLD Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) Profile. Joanna

---

Kulesza and Jonathan Zuck are the co-penholders on this comment, and it closes on 13 October.

There are three open public comments which have to be confirmed status to which the ALAC needs to make decisions, which is also on the agenda, the first being, Registration Directory Service Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Please just review all three of them, and then I'll talk about them.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sure. The second is Proposals for Malayalam and Tamil Scripts' Root Zone Label Generation Rules, which is usually not a topic that the ALAC comments on, but it's open and has not yet been confirmed.

The third is Draft PTI and IANA FY20 Operating Plan and Budgets.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I will suggesting that, as per our normal practice on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules, we do not have a comment. I presume there's no one on this call who will object to that.

On the Draft PTI and IANA FY20 Operating Plan and Budgets, I would suggesting that we ask Mohamed who is our liaison to the Customer Standing Committee and Jean-Jacques who we just appointed to the review team to collaborate and make a recommendation on whether there should be a comment.

---

BARRACK OTIENO: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes? And whether there should be a comment on that and, if so, what should the contents be. Barrack, you wanted to get in on that? Barrack, did you want to speak about this subject?

BARRACK OTIENO: [Not really.] I just joined the call right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. Thank you. So on those two, is there anyone who would like to speak to them or recommend something different than what I'm recommending? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing the only other one is the RDS Review. As chair of that, I don't think I'm in a position to author any comments on it, but is there anyone who would like to? Or do we in this group believe that it needs to be answered, addressed? There are a significant number of issues related to WHOIS, to compliance, and a number of other issues that have traditionally been of some interest to At-Large. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Yes, I think we should do. I think we need to put it forward to the consolidated policy group to do it. Their juices should be still welling from the SubPro and, if memory serves, there's at least possibly

---

four if not five of the recommendations that have some nexus with the subsequent procedures work anyway, one of which at least I think some work is already being done without SubPro. So that's my very biased view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier, is it on the agenda for tomorrow's meeting? Or could it be if it is not already?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can certainly have it on there, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: One of the reasons is because now we haven't really got that much. We've sent one document out, so we'll have some space. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll be sending out something on the EPDP later on today also, so there will be some discussion on that, not necessarily a discussion with any outcome, but there will be a discussion.

All right, so we'll present that as a recommendation going forward at the ALAC meeting. Is there anything else related to policy issues we need to discuss?

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: No, that's all. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, and I have an agenda item a little bit later in the meeting that will address something close to this, but we'll wait for that to come up.

Next agenda item is Updates from Liaisons. Again, if it's something you're going to report – these are necessarily updates that you feel something over and above the written report you feel it's important to bring to people's attention just in case they don't happen to read the written report. Which, of course, we won't comment on. If you're going to report the same thing in the ALAC meeting, no need to report it here, but I will open the floor to liaisons. Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, thank you, Alan. Just to say that the joint GAC/ALAC meeting has been reinstated as a 45-minute meeting in Barcelona. [inaudible] [Anna] with my counterpart on the GAC, we have agreed on an agenda, three points: gTLD, but in more for the principled way than usual. That is to say, basically the question is, who wants new gTLDs in the light of the CCT review? The CCT review is out. It's more than 200 pages so, of course, I hope that many people on the GAC and also many of us will have an idea what they said. The second item is EPDP and the third item is follow up to the joint statement we made in Abu Dhabi. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I did meet with [Jana] and David Conrad when I was in Los Angeles last week specifically on the ITI and how they see progress in relation to the joint ALAC/GAC statement. And unsurprisingly, they basically don't see any progress in that area nor are predicting any because they're looking at a much longer term process than we are. I don't think we or the GAC ever formally responded to the board when they said, "Oh, that's covered by ITI."

So I think the statement we're talking about going forward out of the Barcelona meeting hopefully will address that and point out that we are looking at much shorter term issues. And some will be covered eventually by the ITI if we wait long enough and some won't be covered by the ITI. Things like executive summaries written in a way that can be really comprehended by someone who is not knowledgeable, which probably means guidelines for executive summaries, is not something that they're looking at right now, but it certainly is something that could be considered. So I think we'll need to look at this in some more detail as we go forward.

Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Yes, Alan. We're preparing a draft statement with [Anna] which will [inaudible] very much on the executive summaries, and I hope that it a draft will be available and distributed both to the ALAC and GAC before the meeting. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, that's good. I did recount to them my experience in the RDS review team where I tried to write an executive summary which did not presume you knew everything about WHOIS already and went into some parts of the history, and I was told by my team in no uncertain terms that I should shorten it and cut out all that stuff. So what can I say?

Andrei, please go ahead. Do we have Andrei with us? His hand was up before. Perhaps Andrei doesn't know that you can't speak into Adobe Connect because it's not working.

BARRACK OTIENO: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can hear somebody saying hello.

BARRACK OTIENO: Hello, it's Barrack, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's Barrack. That's not Andrei. Okay, we'll go to Barrack then. Please go ahead, Barrack.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay, thank you. Quick, we got a question from Bart from the ccNSO secretariat this afternoon. They sent a couple of topics that Katrina the



---

ccNSO suggested for discussion during the ALAC/ccNSO session. But they were asking if there's anything specific that the ALAC [in return] would also want to discuss with the ccNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you forward that message to the ALT or, better still, post the suggested topics on our wiki page?

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay, I will forward this right away and put it on the wiki as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Andrei says there's nothing in addition to his report, so we'll go ahead. Last call for any updates we have from liaisons or others.

Then we will go on to the next item, which is Rules of Procedure Update. I sent to the ALT members directly the other day a proposed update to the Rules of Procedure and the e-mail guide that has since gone out to the whole ALAC list, and I will be doing a very brief presentation just to give some idea of the gist of what the changes are.

I hope most or close to all of the changes will not be controversial. They're a hodgepodge of corrections of minor errors in the original document, links that needed to be updated, renumbering of the ICANN bylaws which reflects a number of pointers and things like that, and a number of clarifications where there has been some confusion as we've moved forward over the years.

---

It also updates a couple of areas in relation to the ICANN new Empowered Community bylaws or other bylaws that went along with it. An example is the bylaws now give the responsibility to the AC/SO chairs to select specific review team members. That's not an AC/SO responsibility but the chair's. We've never had before a responsibility of the chairs in their own right. So there's a section that I've added in to cover those kinds of things.

There's also a change. Necessarily, it says that the Empowered Community representative must only act in accordance with directions from the ALAC. The exception to that is the appointment of directors or the removal of directors that some part of the organization has directed be removed through appropriate due process. The Empowered Community representatives don't have any discretion to do that or not. The Empowered Community must provide the appropriate instruction, and there's a minor change that covers that.

The only slightly controversial one might be a section on the petition process for the board member selection. This last time was the first time that process was used and the interpretation that Tijani had was quite different from the original intent of the petition process where the petition process was designed to say if three RALOs feel very strongly that the BCEC erred, then if they all petition for a candidate to be added, then that candidate will be added to the slate. His interpretation is if one RALO does it, the other ones all have to have a vote to see whether they agree or not, which is not the same as essentially a spontaneous groundswell of support for a particular candidate. So I have proposed wording that makes that clear.

---

Maureen, I know we've had a discussion on it in the last couple of days and supports that intent. But we'll see going forward if there's anyone else who has a problem with that. Ultimately, if anything is so contentious we can't agree on it, we'll just remove it from the change so that we can effect the other changes going forward.

Any comments? Cheryl has also expressed an opinion on this. Cheryl, I think you and I are the last people active right now who were very active in the creation of the rules. I'm not sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Who were part of that torturous process. Well, if we discount Avri who I would think is active but no longer really in our ranks, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's correct. I'll point out that not everything that went into the rules is something that Cheryl and I – I was the one who ended up drafting the revised rules that we implemented in our previous Rules of Procedure, but I'll make it clear that neither I nor Cheryl necessarily agreed with some of them, but that is the consensus that the overall community came up with. Such is the lot of a leader sometimes of doing what the community says, not necessarily what you believe yourself. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Just if it is of use, Alan, on this particular point, this was a specific aspect, this ability to petition, that was brought in and not changed at this stage with our decision when we did the last review. It

---

was brought in after the extensive community consultation specific to the Seat 15 selection process. It was brought in by Avri, and it was brought in based in IETF experience. It is also something that those who are familiar with ISOC mechanisms also are comfortable with. So it was put there as a security blanket just in case the wheels fell off things and we needed the ability to say, “You bleeding idiots. You’ve made such an awful balls-up of it. Here we are.” It is not a right or a part of the normal process.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Right. The rule that went in was quite clearly that three RALOs had to feel strongly about the same candidate before it would happen. Now it’s interesting that the change that Tijani recommended, which is every other RALO must vote on a candidate if one RALO has, significantly makes a more complex procedure that we’ve already been told is too complex by some. So it’s just interesting insight. In any case, we’ll see where it goes.

Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. Since the current chair and a past chair have spoken about this, another past chair can speak about this too and I certainly agree with your interpretation. I mean, running a set of elections like this and having been at the heart of the process at the time, having this petition process if you want, I always felt that this was actually demeaning or de-crediting the work of the selection committee. So it is, indeed, a safeguard.

---

It is, indeed, a safety net in case someone has really been missed and the community really, really, really likes them. But then imposing another vote on top of all of the other votes on all of the RALOs is one of these things which I find that then it's like we have one safety net and then we could have another safety net. We could have two votes. Why not? It just becomes even more and more difficult. And as I said, why then do we bother even having a selection committee at that point?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, to be quite candid, Tijani is suggesting that the selection committee not actually make value judgments but just see whether boxes are ticked off or not. But that's another area I don't think we need to go into right now.

I think it's interesting that if we were to have such a rule that the other RALOs must hold a vote, what do we do if they don't? We have no way to penalize them, so it's a rather hollow "must" in my mind.

Olivier, last call, and then we're going to go on to another item.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thanks, Alan. It really is down to whether we trust the selection committee or not. The selection committee is made up of people from each one of the different regions. If one doesn't respect the selection committee enough to say, "Well, that's for the better of ALAC," then let's just abolish the selection committee at that point. I mean, making it even more complicated is not going to help our cause.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Look, there is an infinite number of ways we could change the process. If we want to change the process, then we need to do an evaluation of those changes. Whether it's with just the ALAC or the ALAC and the wider community, obviously that's for the ALAC to decide. The ALAC is the one that ultimately approves the rules or not. This revision of the Rules of Procedure was not intended to change direction and to do things differently. It is solely to make corrections, to institute things which have become common practice in the rules to avoid extra work.

For instance, we now regularly take the chairs of our major working groups and put them on the public ALAC list, and we think that's a good way of communication but it has to be done by an act of the ALAC each time. And I'm suggesting that we just make it a rule instead of having the ALAC have to focus on things.

So there is no intent to change how we are doing things other than to formalize things that are already part of our standard practice. If we want a different path forward with regard to anything, whether it's how we accept ALSes or how we hold our meetings, that's the subject of a revision but not this revision.

All right then, I'd like to go forward to the next item on the agenda, and that is the ALAC Policy Involvement. What I did is – I think I may have mentioned this in the ALT, I'm not sure – the Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) has a mailing list which is simply the union of the three mailing lists of our other three policy groups. So it should have no members in its own right.

---

If you are a member of any of the groups, then you are implicitly a member of CPWG. Due to a misunderstanding, there are about 15 people who are members of that group, and we are in the process of asking them what groups do they want to be a member of which will implicitly make them a CPWG member and remove their individual memberships.

In doing this, I also decided to look at who in the ALAC is a member of the individual groups. The results I found out were interesting and, at some levels in my mind, troubling. You'll see the chart on the display right now. It's also linked to the agenda if you want to look at your own copy. That's the 15 ALAC members. I didn't do the same thing for the RALO leaders, although I think it probably would be a good exercise.

What you'll notice is there are a few people, Maureen and I and Tijani I think are the only ones who are members of all three policy groups. Others are members of some of them, and there are several ALAC members who are members of none of them, which essentially says that they in theory don't have any interest in any of those subjects. I find that a little bit troubling. We don't have any rule saying you must be a member of our policy activities, but I find the concept troubling.

Now I will admit that these groups until recently have not been very active, but they are now increasingly active. We have the gTLD working group, registration issues which is to a large extent WHOIS related things, and IANA issues. It's called IANA issues. It's now called the ICANN evolution, and it's essentially internal ICANN issues, accountability or reviews or whatever else is of interest to the internal workings of ICANN.

---

I think going forward it would be a positive thing if all ALAC members had an interest in at least one of them if not more. I'm not sure we can mandate it, but I just did this work in the last day or so and I thought I'd share it here. I'm not putting it on the ALAC call, and we're not trying to shame people into joining at this point. We will fix the issue with the CPWG membership and make sure that they are members of the other working groups, one or more. But I just wanted to share that with you, and we can do with it as we will going forward.

Eduardo says Javier is a member of the gTLD working group. Not according to the mailing list he isn't. It's quite possible I missed someone in this work. I didn't double check.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't think Eduardo is remembering that you're referring to the ALAC internal ones, not the wider GNSO ones.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not the GNSO Subsequent Procedures, no. We're looking at the ALAC working group, the place we should be discussing these issues here.



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I understand that. I'm just pointing out that's where the confusion comes in looking at Javier. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I understood. And I may well have made a mistake and missed someone. I didn't spend six hours doing this, and there's no easy way to do it. But I did go through the effort. Anyway, I'm sharing it, and we can move forward. And Maureen, obviously, going forward may want to try to encourage her new ALAC to be more active in some of these groups, especially now that with Jonathan and Olivier the actual work has picked up again and they're now not defunct.

Anyway, next item on the agenda is the EPDP. I will try to give a very quick summary. I'm not going to spend a lot of time. I will spend more time on the ALAC call. There was a three-day meeting in Los Angeles last week, and there was a two-hour meeting today, a first teleconference after the meeting.

We did make some progress. Some of that progress then got wiped back because people ended up not agreeing with some of the things we decided on. We spent a significant amount of time today talking about whether you need a technical contact. That is, is it important to have to be able to contact a registrant or their delegate about technical issues with the website, you can't get to it or whatever? There are significant people saying, no, that's probably not a real requirement. It's somewhat discouraging.

It's one of the things that did come out of the meeting, and Göran was there and met with us for a little while. One of the things that came out

---

which has been said before but has not really made an impression is one of ICANN's targets right now, and they're investigating multiple ways, is to try to reduce liabilities for the contracted parties. That is, reduce the chance that they are going to be subject to fines or orders to stop doing business for that matter which are conceivable under the GDPR. Whether it is possible to do that is not clear.

But it's an important issue, number one, because obviously the contracted parties are worried about penalties and, number two, the whole domain system concept will collapse if contracted parties start being subject to some of these penalties. The third thing is a unified access model which implies automated access to data for some people is likely completely impossible unless we can reduce the liabilities of the contracted parties.

So still lots of work to do. We do plan to have a report of some sort ready just before or just after Barcelona. It will essentially hopefully be identifying the legal purposes for collecting the various elements and doing other things with them. And that's a very core part of the process, and it's the part that the data commissioners have identified as we have been lacking. That we have not really justified why we need some of this data or what we're going to do with it.

So I'm semi-optimistic going forward. I'll be a little bit more optimistic in the ALAC meeting than I am here. But there's still lots of work to be done. We are making some progress. Not nearly as much as perhaps we should have.

I'll take any questions and then go on to the next item. Not a thing?

---

Then we will go on to the next item, which is At-Large review, and I'll turn it over to Maureen and/or Cheryl.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay, I'll start. I hope you can hear me. Okay, just very, very briefly going over what I will be talking about at the ALAC meeting about the ARIWG Plan Development, basically explaining that this is a progress chart which will record how we're going with the different implementation issues.

The Prioritization and Dependencies Workspace is just that. It's a workspace where people are actually – and I'm very encouraged by it – populating the various templates with ideas and things which I hope people [of which] these teams will take note of when you're developing your [final steps].

Also associated with the templates is that continuous improvement section which does not have anything to do with the actual steps that we're working on but are things that we'll probably incorporate into another document for consideration later. But I don't want people to stop looking at that as well as they're looking at trying to show others that we are looking at continuous improvement as being part of our culture.

But one of the things that [inaudible] was the fact that there was a glitch in relation to the ARIWG mailing list, and I guess it's related somewhat to what Alan was talking about before about having these various lists and that's the only way you could become a member of that list. But I think there was a bit of confusion because staff were

---

looking at the official, the original members and participants list versus what I was wanting everyone or anyone who wanted to volunteer volunteering to be part of an issues team should be on the mailing list because they will be involved in the actual working group and that they might want to make comments.

So we had about ten people who were on the issues team but weren't on the mailing list. That has been amended now, which is good. I sent out a message to everyone to just update them and with some apologies on the fact that some people hadn't been informed as they should have been.

And then just an aside are the [inaudible] talking with the public interest [inaudible] of which Tom McKenzie is actually a member also. So I'm sure he would be interested in what we're doing.

I think that's [inaudible]. That's it. Thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds great. If it takes that long in the next meeting, that will be even better.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two points. Number one, if I were you I wouldn't mention this to Tom, but that's your call, obviously. If he mentions it, fine. Tell him things are going along just dandy. After his comments on the At-Large [dot watch], let's show the dirty laundry page, I'm not sure we want to – anyway, I'll go on to my question.

---

As some of you may have seen, there was an exchange between me and Maureen on the priorities and prerequisites, whatever the word is, of connection between these things. And I do have some concern that we are assigning penholders, not penholders but key people, to take responsibility for the recommendations that we outright rejected and the ones that we effectively got approval from the board to not focus on.

I'm a little worried that if we start taking action on those, whatever the action is whether it's [inaudible] continuous improvement or something else, that it's going to be perceived as us deciding that we weren't right, that they were things of substance that ITEMS got right just like the registrars and the NCUC or NCSG said and we should have been addressing them and honoring their recommendations.

So I have a real worry that in addition to perhaps putting focus on things and effort on things as part of the review process that is already going to be complex and hard enough, that we are adding in items that we could just be crossing off completely.

That's not to say we shouldn't look at them in an ongoing process. But to take an item saying that we should be funded outside of the normal ICANN operational budget, and specifically from the auctions but if not auctions then something else, and saying we're going to work on it is putting credence to something which I think should be discarded. There's no way we can be funded outside of the ICANN operational budget.

---

And there are a whole number of other things. The same with the director selection. We said, yes, it may change over time and if we decide it needs to change, it will. But we're not going to do anything as a part of the review. Including it as an operational element, I find, is somewhat problematic. But that's my opinion. My opinion has much less weight three weeks from now than it does today, but I thought I'd air it to this group.

[MAUREEN HILYARD]:

Thank you, Alan. [Assuming] I'm in charge of this [darn] thing and I'm next, far be it from me to disagree with you at all in these things, but I also remember that what [they] will put together before Barcelona is a draft document for discussion. That's why I want to spend time in Barcelona allowing people to hear what you're saying but also take into account some of the things that they feel perhaps could still be added in their in relation to the actual proposal document – I mean, we're sticking to the proposal, but we're looking – there could be things that people feel strongly about adding to it. But that's got to come from the group.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. I don't want to make a debate about it, but we – and I in particular – spent an immense amount of effort building the cases why certain things should not be addressed as part of the review. And I think we are increasing our work and perhaps decreasing our credibility by going back and starting to work on some of those things as part of the review. That's not to say they can't be looked at, but doing them as

---

part of the review when we through agonizing number of documents made the case we shouldn't and the board agreed with us, I think is not a wise path. But as I said, I've said my words and so be it.

Anything else on the review before we proceed to the next item?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Not from me.

ALAN GREENBERG: The next item on the agenda is ICANN 63. Again, as noted at the beginning of the call, let's not just present things that we're going to present at the ALAC meeting. But there are a few issues and, I think, questions for the board is one of them. Travel issues are another. Perhaps social events if they relate to the – or ALT specific events are the ones I'd like to cover right now. I'll turn it over, I think, to Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, thank you. If I could just hand it to Heidi just for a minute. I've been offline for a little while with some computer issues. So I don't have the documents up. My computer crashed. I'm just trying to get my ducks in a row. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Gisella. I'm not going to go through the agenda. I have put the link to the Saturday agendas which will take you through all of the rest of the week. I have started to put in and made, I think, good

---

progress on the agendas. Please do take a look at that. I will be going through it, I believe, on the ALAC call. Maureen and Cheryl, please do look at Saturday in particular because you'll be leading a lot of those sessions.

I did just want to highlight that there are some time slots, considerable timeslots, available still. And if we could, I would welcome suggestions for topics. Particularly I believe on Tuesday there are entire sessions still open. And I think we've pretty much added most of the items that Alan and you have discussed previously. So that is what I wanted to note.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And don't agonize over exactly where they are on the agenda. There's likely to be a fair amount of juggling there. But do pay attention to whether it's Saturday or not, especially if you're not going to be there on Saturday. And there are a number of people who will not be there on Saturday. If you're aware of any other conflict you have on Sunday or Tuesday, then also obviously note that. But there will be some juggling. But as Heidi mentioned, we do have still a couple of hours open. We can elongate things we've done already, we already have there, or we can add new topics if we believe there are things that are relevant that need to be discussed.

Heidi, is that a new hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, it is.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, I see that you're needing to be cloned. So in order to try to avoid that, I'm just going to look at Saturday very quickly. And then also, Yrjö, do we know...

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, you said Cheryl and Maureen will be running Saturday. As far as I know, Cheryl is occupied all Saturday.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so let me – I'm just going through because I know that there are some issues. Well, Maureen, you can handle most of these. I just need you to look.

ALAN GREENBERG: We also have another vice chair who can handle sessions also.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. So just confirming that, Maureen, you will be able...

ALAN GREENBERG: Me and my team are not dead until the end of the week.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. So, Maureen, just confirming that you will be able to be there all day on Saturday. I think, actually, that will work then. And, Cheryl, noted regarding Saturday.

Yrjö, do you happen to have the final GAC and ALAC agenda? I know that there was a leadership call, but if you could send that to us, that would be useful.

And I believe Gisella is ready to go.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, yes. I know that we're not going to duplicate what we're doing here. We're trying not to duplicate the ALT and the ALAC call, but what I have put online is what the meetings team sent around yesterday as the latest schedule. For your information, the schedule is live on the ICANN 63 website. There may still be a couple of tweaks but nothing major. I believe one of the tweaks may be concerning Alan but, again, I believe the RDS may have been finalized. Is that correct, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, say that again?

GISELLA GRUBER: One of the outstanding issues was the RDS. Has that been cleared with you now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it's on Thursday. But RDS wasn't an ALAC conflict.

GISELLA GRUBER: No, no, no. I was just pointing out that with regards to what we're looking at in the Adobe Connect which is the complete ICANN schedule there were only a couple of outstanding items one of which was the RDS for Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it's on Thursday against the high-interest topic.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay, thank you, Alan. I've also put the ICANN 63 schedule link in the Adobe Connect room. I hope that does come through for you. As I said, the schedule is up, and now Heidi is working on the detailed agendas which we will go through on the ALAC call.

With regards to any social events, everything will be posted on our wiki pages as well. At this stage, we are aware of the gala which is happening on the Wednesday evening. There will probably be private events as well. We won't be having an ALAC dinner for the ALAC – well, I'd like to say and At-Large dinner for all the travelers in Barcelona. There will be a slightly different format.

That's probably about as much of an update I'm going to give now before we enter into the ALAC call later where we might go into the day-by-day agendas in more detail.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else? What about travel issues? Do we have anyone with any outstanding visa or other travel issues that we know about?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, we don't have any outstanding issues. As you may be aware, Seun has not been granted a visa. Daniel Nanghaka has received his visa. And as it stands now, everyone else should be coming to ICANN 63.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Can someone review what the ALT specific events are?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, for the old ALT, we don't have anything scheduled at the meeting. We have an 8:30 start on Saturday morning with both the ALAC sessions and you being at the EPDP. And then the GNSO sessions start at 9:00, the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Work Track 5. The new ALT will be meeting on Thursday, October 25, in the evening for a dinner. There was initially a meeting planned in the afternoon, but we've had to cancel that due to a conflict in sessions with the ICANN 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. And my intent is to recommend that everyone of our team, ALAC regional leaders and others who are there on Saturday, to the extent that they are not actively involved in some At-Large event should be participating, watching, and/or actively depending on the rules in

---

either the EPDP or the gTLD Subsequent Procedures work. So people should have plenty to do.

Any further comments or issues related to this? The only board question that was raised was the one that I raised particularly asking the critical question of, who and how are we're going to decide to what extent we have new gTLDs and what are the financial implications of that? The PDP is spending a huge amount of effort, largely on the presumption that there will be future rounds or future allocations of gTLDs. It is still largely a cost recovery effort. It's not clear what the financial implications are of ICANN proper in the operational budget of new gTLDs. So the question is, how is this being thought about? Because clearly it's an important aspect of any new gTLDs.

So that's the question I'm asking. I don't know to what extent there are any other questions that people have. The deadline was yesterday for submitting it. So if there is anything else, it better be formulated and agreed to very quickly.

And, of course, we have our answers to the board questions and those who will be dealing with there will be a session allocated at Barcelona for discussing those.

I see no hands, hear no voices. Then let's go on to the next agenda item of ATLAS III. Again, it is Maureen, Cheryl, and Olivier this time.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay, going back to – I'll just be providing a very brief update on what we've been doing and might ask Gisella to give an update on the

---

logistics that we've been talking about to give a more articulate view of what she's been involved in anyway.

Although Olivier, who is now the co-chair and he is going to be working on the program, I know he has been working with his team and I'm not quite sure if he'll have an update but, Olivier, do you think you'll be able to say anything about the program?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Maureen. We don't really have an update, per se. We're just working on the program. We have to start looking at building teams, but one of the things that came out is we don't want to build massive teams with 25 people of which 3 are actually doing the work and the other 22 are just enjoying the ride. So we're still discussing this and it's a soft start, but we're getting there. At present, it's just Eduardo, Maureen, and I that are kind of leading the show on these things. There's really not very much else to talk about. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, but you might just mention that we're actually starting something anyway.

I know that one of the more controversial things that we need to be looking at will be the criteria for selection. I put something up on the metrics template, and already there have been some questions asked. But when we're actually talking about that another group will probably be formed but it will include also the ATLAS organizing group plus the people who are actually involved in contributing to the ATLAS

---

implementation group as well as the metrics implementation group. So just getting a couple of representatives from each of those areas to perhaps look at a more achievable set of criteria but still ensuring that we're actually capturing the people that we really want to have at this event. So I'll probably reword that a bit differently for the ALAC meeting.

Okay, that's me. Cheryl, did you have anything [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Remember, I'm very much only an advisor. I should be utterly silent unless there is a point in which I need to contribute. I will, however, be in each and every one of whatever group is put together to try and at least keep some on the line or in the paddock because. Otherwise, you're going to end up with people believing that if they get in a group, it somehow means they're going to be a traveler, and that's not going to be the case.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, so that means that in the ALAC meeting, Heidi, I'm not quite sure what the agenda says, but it should just be me and Olivier then please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, noted. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, at least [inaudible] that's all. Let's avoid it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I certainly see myself and Cheryl as the people to occasionally give sage advice and to waive red flags when we see disaster looming, hopefully before disaster is imminent.

To be blunt, a number of us have put our reputations on the line fighting for ATLAS and I think we really need a success. So there is some importance to this. Other than just achieving what we're trying to achieve in this, there is some other importance also.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: From my point of view, I'm just so tempted to say, "And what the hell would I know?" I've only done, this will be three of them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, exactly. Only people who have done six or more can speak up at this point. Or zero, of course. Those are always the experts.

Any further comments on ATLAS? I'll repeat what I said earlier and I will not say in the ALAC meeting. I could but I won't. My concern is not having enough people who meet our qualifications. So setting the qualifications then finding the people is going to be an interesting challenge. But I am optimistic we will find 60 good people.



---

Next item on the agenda is Preview of ALAC meeting. We have nothing really to say. It's going to follow the overall pattern of this one. There is an item to abolish the review working party which will take all of about 12 seconds, I'm hoping, assuming we have quorum to have a vote. And other than that, there are no real surprises on that call. I hope it will be a short call also. This one it looks like will be, and I've just been told Leon is not available so there is ten minutes we have just shortened off the meeting right there and then.

Last item on the agenda is Any Other Business. We have none suggested at the beginning. This is a last call for any other business.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, [inaudible] any other business [inaudible] does run long, I will have to leave. I have a family funeral to attend.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, my condolences. That meeting will not go long. I'm hoping it will not last the full two hours, but I will believe under no conditions will it be more than that.

Anyone else? Then I call this meeting to an end. Thank you all who managed to join us, and we'll see you very shortly on the ALAC call. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**