

---

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well fifteen minutes past the hour, should we start. I think we could have brought -- we did enough for --

Okay, good morning everyone, thanks for coming in so early this morning. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Chair of the Work Team D, and well the top -- the agenda is really just a review of what was discussed on Sunday; and what exactly is our plans moving forward, in time for the Tuesday session.

Just to do the roll call -- just to do roll call, I can see Rudi, Olivier, myself, Seth and Heidi and Cheryl. So I think -- I guess one of the first things we should start off with, we had a presentation of Work Team D on Sunday, and I just wanted to know if there was any initial feedback from the slides; was there something that was stated within the slides that wasn't -- that should have been added to this or -- anyone wishes to comment on Sunday, because there's only one comment received from Jean-Jacques.

Well, just to cover what Jean-Jacques was saying, and if I -- I hope I'm -- I can remember this early in the morning, it was regarding the use of calendar days to measure the length of the public comment period; and the suggestion was and we should consider it, we should consider measuring the length of comment period in working days.

So my initial thought is that the problem with working days, and it was brought up in a previous Work Team D meeting was that



---

working days vary from country -- region to region, so how exactly would we count these working days properly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I think Jean-Jacques also gave us -- sorry, Cheryl Langdon off the record, Jean-Jacques also gave us a result of some study that the ICANN staff did for the Public Participation committee, where they did -- they were tasked by the PBC to look at the differences in regional areas on what is working days, etc., etc., and the result of that was to still use the term, working days.

Now, I guess we can ask -- so I think we should fit in with that conformity rule. What we need to do, though, is have the link to the results of that study, so it's not us being the authority, but us referring to an authority of the third party study that was done, and what we should probably annotate, if not ask, but at least flag for future reference is this may mean that in future requests for extensions, or for closing dates, that the dates are properly calculated to be working days that suit the final working day in the region, the other side of the timeline from America.

So for example, if they're going to be closing something on the 30th of September, and the 30th of September happens to be a Saturday in Asia, that's not a good choice of date. So we might just need to finesse that if it becomes a problem. At the moment, I don't predict it as a problem, because unlike when the At-Large and ALAC review was done, when things were 30 days and no correspondence would be entered into, and staff had to get down



on bended knees, and you know do all sorts of things to even get a day or two extension; we have a much more proactive system now, and the Public Participation committee has already said extensions to 45 days or more can be sought by the ALAC.

So it's less of a problem than it was when this issue was first identified, but I do see using working days, is still an issue, particularly when -- not just in policy development -- excuse me, not just in policy development, but particularly when we've had things with travel -- constituency travel, not so much the ICANN constituency travel people, but the people who would sending out from the travel companies, when they would send something on what was effectively a Friday in the US, and non-working day in Asia, and giving people three days to respond.

And that's just not good enough. You either send it out on a Wednesday, midweek for everybody, so it has to capture a couple of working days, or you do it at the beginning of a week and give four or five days to respond. So I you know --

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Not seeing -- not having read that Public Participation committee report on it, okay, well I was going to ask if there was a definition explaining the working days and so on. And then do we then see our -- we modify our proposal to say working days and then as discussed in the PPC reports and so on and so -- okay.



---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dev, if I may --

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl again, perhaps it should be an action item on the staff to talk to the support staff in Public Participation because not all of their reports are public and we would need this one to be.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, thanks for clarifying that. I thought all -- the reports are all public, okay, well, that would be a useful action item to take on. Were there any other comments regarding the Working D's presentation and proposals made? No, no? Ah, good morning, Edmon. Okay, well that's good.

Well, one of the other issues on -- then will be, what do we do in time for Thursday, because I believe there is on the schedule on Thursday, we're going to have to come back to the work, and I guess I'm looking for guidance from the ALAC members as to what exactly does -- do you want the Work Team to do? Do you want to resubmit this -- like a page with just all the proposals on one page? What does ALAC want the Work Team D to do? Olivier?



Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm sorry; I'm trying to make sense of what I've got on my screen at the moment.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure, I know how that is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, Dev, Cheryl again.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: While we have the filibustering on the Chair of the ALAC's Board, I would think that having a simple listing of the primary proposals from each Work Team on a page would be a very good thing for the ALAC to operate through.

I also would think that at this point, we have given ample exposure to the rationale behind all of the recommendations. So I'd be putting these recommendations as a list and also good putting forward a suggested form of resolution, but that's really up to -- up to Olivier, whether he wants the ALAC to form the resolution, or whether he wants some suggested language coming from the Work Teams.



Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think -- Olivier here, I think I would prefer the Work Teams to come up with preferred language. They know their subject well enough to write about it; I hope that they know their subject well enough to write about it, and then of course the ALAC will take all of the notes, and put a larger document together. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just following on from you, Olivier, Cheryl again. We also need to note for the record that, of course, the Work Teams, each and every one of them do have ALAC members as an integral part of them, and I would be approaching each -- I would encourage each Chair of the Work Teams, perhaps again this is something, Seth, you might want to go and walk the corridors and make sure it happens, to approach one and two, if they have them, of the ALAC members in their Work Team, and basically say let's get together on this wording, and will you move these resolutions.

So you should be able to come with a mover and a seconder from the ALAC for most of these resolutions. That gets them on the table, gets them on the formal agenda, if there's friendly amendments, we can deal with it, and I think that possibly the fastest way, but that's just me.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Go ahead, Olivier.



Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dev, Olivier here. I have a question actually. With regards to the responsibility of getting the text written, I understand there are two chairs or the two co-chairs in each of the Working Teams. By having an ALAC person in there, should the ALAC person also be taking part in the writing, and taking responsibility for writing, or should they just act as a liaison?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well in some cases, of course the ALAC person is one of the co-chairs. I think that's going to be a team-by-team decision. The dynamics of the teams are fairly good, and I would think that when we have a situation whether neither of the co-chairs are ALAC members, they have -- look around who's here, three ALAC members, all of whom are not backward in coming forward, and if they don't like the "absolute," the "apparent," or the "maybe" in the sentence, will go, well, yes, we'll put that forward, but you'll need to change the following words.

So I think that can be dealt with, but I'd prefer them to have a draft to look at, than be involved in the creation process.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: You may reply.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dev. Olivier here. The reason why I asked this question is because when ALAC meets afterwards, if none of the people who took part in the writing of the document are present



---

during that call, or during that meeting, it becomes very difficult if there are ambiguities in the text to understand why those ambiguities are there, or to explain the text itself, which is the reason why I would imagine that for those teams that have two co-chairs that are not on ALAC, that ALAC person that would then take this to ALAC would have to take an active part in the writing of the text. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or at least accept it as read and understood.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I mean, I think that the idea is that you know you can raise the questions before -- before the Thursday meeting, right? So, I'm sorry, Seth, you have -- you were going to say something?

Seth Greene: Yes, but it slipped my mind.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Don't worry; it's going to come back.

Seth Greene: Thank you Dev. I was actually just wondering Olivier and Cheryl if -- I just don't understand this point, I'm sorry. Will the ALAC actually be considering the proposals during the 45 minutes or I think an hour to actually only 30 minutes on Thursday, or are they -- are Olivier, are you going to -- what I would expect are you



---

going to go away with the proposals and not discuss them at that point?

Female: Discuss them?

Seth Greene: Discuss them, not resolve them at that point?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Seth, Olivier here. They would -- if I was to tell you that they would actually read all the proposals and make a decision on them in 45 minutes, I think that we must be in the top class at MIT, or some place; and unfortunately, I think none of us can pretend to be in the top class at MIT, so yes, we'll read them, we'll discuss them, and then we'll have to go and chew on them for a while before making decision, thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, I would say you were better than MIT, but anyway, sorry, Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Thank you Dev. I think one of us, and I may whistle and you can point, if that's necessary would move that having looked at the resolutions, had them discussed, we now take them for a seven day vote online, but indeed miracles may happen, and we may have



---

such unanimity -- we might all agree, and if we all agree, who knows. Olivier may call for a vote, and the magic may be done.

Dennis Jennings: This is Denny, can I break in with a question?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, you do, go ahead.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you Cheryl. I'm having difficulty understanding the intent of what you folks are doing. Recently I noticed that the GAC took the hold of a situation, they identified issues that were outstanding with regard to the new gTLD process, and put out a 31-page document, the most I think I've ever seen the ALAC come up with is a few paragraphs on a subject. Is there any reason why we can't have the ALAC deal with policy matters a bit more intensely?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Denny?

Dennis Jennings: Yes, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I mean you and I sort of can probably fill in words because we've talked for so many years, but Dev and the rest of us here in the room are having difficulty, if you can say it slightly slowly and the



---

key points again, I believe you were saying the difference between the output of what the ALAC does, and what other parts of the organization, such as the GAC has recently done, but just so I'm not incorrectly interpreting you, if you would repeat your key points again, that would be appreciated.

Dennis Jennings:

Thank you, Cheryl, that was the correct interpretation. The flow charts that Working Team D has created points to a responsive situation wherein other people comment on policy and ALAC response.

I would rather see a situation where the ALAC takes the bull by the horns, identifies an issue and writes up 30 pages on the subject. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Well, I'm not sure we can do that in time for Thursday, but I mean if that is what needs to be done, then we should -- I mean I'm willing to try to compile such a report and integrate that as one big document to submit. I think that's what the essence of what he's trying to say.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Denny, Cheryl here, I just -- I just want to capture what you've said, and bring to the record related to that particular question and challenge, some of the discussions this particular Work Team has had in another calls.



And that is we also recognize that whilst this Work Team is being reactive to a current public comment design, and that is the way that the implementation of -- of our particular points under the ALAC review, and I've now forgotten which number it is, but Dev can help me in a minute, that this is responding to, we also recognize that assuming and it's a huge assumption, that what the Accountability and Transparency Review Team has recommended to the board, changes how public comments happen, that this flow chart has been designed to be easily and rapidly modified to look at the two-phase process of iteration and reactivity with issues that the ALAC needs to raise to be more proactive.

Of course that very much is in the gamut of what we, as an advisory committee need to do and need to continue to do; what this flow chart is attempting to ensure is that the edge communities and the regions are at least involved in a predictable way with the lowest common denominator requirements for public comments.

This then means that the ALAC who should be doing more advisory committee work and being proactive as you desire, is not involved in making sure public comments come in on behalf of the At-Large community, but that the At-Large community, the ALSs, the individuals and the regions are well-engaged themselves. We can still act as a conduit facilitation and aggregation point and that is what's designed in the flow charts.



---

But at the moment, we know that the whole concept of how a public comment goes -- comes out to the public, the predictability associated with it, and the possibility of it going into a two-step iterative and then final stage is also going to be happening in the next couple of years. Should ALAC do more what ALAC is meant to do and be proactive? Absolutely. But at the moment, we're trying to ensure that the ALSs and the structure we've got, the three level structure we've got works as well.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Cheryl. So, okay -- so we can in time for Thursday, get the proposals all on one page, but I mean in terms of a final report, is it -- because obviously, I think ideally it would -- because without the flow charts is needed in such a final report.

Who is compiling that report I guess is my question. Is it us, me, the team? Is it the ALAC putting it all together and then approving it and then you know, that's my question. And so one is, when do you want -- when is that document needed to be produced?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think you'll find that if we use the ALAC as an aggregator, and we take materials prepared by those best equipped to do so, in other words the Work Teams involving individual members, involving the regional leads and leaders in the Work Teams, then we've got agreed language coming to the ALAC; and basically, I would think Seth is going a huge -- a major role in stitching this all



---

together. So you know perhaps it should be over to you Seth, to see whether you're going to duck or cover, or say yes.

Seth Greene: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Music to my ears, thank you, Seth, I like it when you say yes.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, really -- I'm just wondering, have we discovered any point of conflicts between statements we have actually already on paper between the different groups in order to avoid that when we produce a document, and we put it together, we've have the four teams, that at the end we have some opposites in what we are presenting. So I think we have to clarify a bit if there are any conflicts popping between the teams.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I would say, I guess Seth will then I think red flag any particular proposals that are in conflict with each other.

Seth Greene: Yes, certainly, but you know that makes me think, Rudi, actually -- this is Seth. That makes me actually think of another very related question and that is the organization of this final report. Frankly I've been envisioning it as four separate major sections, one for each Work Team, but perhaps that's actually not the most efficient way for seeing these -- any conflicts that may exist, perhaps we



---

should do it topically and independent, regardless of what Work Teams have come up with the proposals and I see Cheryl and Rudi, okay, thank you very much for that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And just -- just to help you breath more easily, some people are across all of the Work Teams, not just Seth as staff, and some people may very well have noticed if there was glaring- Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you very much. Right, yes. So in the proposal that was in the presentation on Sunday, was there anything -- I think we captured the main proposals. Was there anything that we've missed I think is my -- and that we need include in time for Thursday?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think so, but I might suggest that we note for Thursday, and just -- just a note, that and this is very much from Denny's contribution intervention today, that we might just do a little preamble sentence in the report.

So we need to flag to the ALAC that we, as Work Team D, will be doing a preamble sentence in our report that is very clear on saying that these mechanisms and these proposals is designed to get the current structure better involved in the current procedures, etc.



---

Say again. With the intention of freeing up the ALAC and its volunteers to be A, informed and prepared by the activities coming up from the regions and the ALSs with what the At-Large believes to also then the proactive, as an advisory committee needs to be. Because at the moment, we do do it occasionally, but it's only for screaming obvious things that people have a problem with, and we have had a few successes such as we've seen in the Pedner policy development process. But it probably is worthwhile to give that rationale.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Go ahead, Seth.

Seth Greene: Thanks, Dev. Cheryl, related to what you just said, I would think - - my assumption is that in fact that doesn't just apply to Work Team D, right, it applies to for example Outreach, it applies to all of the Work Teams? Okay, thank you very much.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, so perhaps in time for Thursday, I can include some wording, because when I mention the PRC, I didn't really put on the slide the reason, or I mention it in the presentation, that the reason why you're trying to do this is because they're trying to -- the barrier being that you wanted to involve the ALSs more directly in the policy development process, and in At-Large, and not so much ALAC alone, well ALAC at the top managing it so much, so we can probably work on that language for Thursday.



So, then I'm -- so David, I'm sorry is it -- go ahead.

[background conversation]

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Oh, sorry, I'm still connecting to this so anyway, that being said is there -- well, is there any other business for the Work Team to consider? I mean, what is going to -- I mean, and I guess I'm asking is that do we need to have any future meetings for Work Team D after San Francisco?

Sorry, my question was, are we going to have any other meetings for Work Team D after San Francisco? Yes, go ahead Seth.

Seth Greene: Thanks, Dev. If I could just make a suggestion to the Work Team, I would think that perhaps -- perhaps there would be for Work Team D, I guess given the status of the work, one meeting at the very least, probably to be scheduled not immediately or necessarily even according to the regular Work Team D time slot, but after those from the Work Team and myself who do a lot of work on this section of the report that will then be integrated and combined, the Work Team could meet to review it, and make sure that we have, and you have a consensus, and that would go for all Work Teams I suppose, the same model.



Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, yes. Thanks Olivier. Well, let's see is there any other business that the Work Team needs to consider and wishes to raise any points, because otherwise we could close off. I don't know, because is there any other issues? Okay. Going once, going -- all right -- I see Cheryl's finger on the trigger there. Oh, I'm so sorry, go ahead Seth.

Seth Greene: Well, pardon me for coming back to this again, but you know it strikes me, I'm just wondering about the amount of time during the ALAC meeting, the wrap up that is. Perhaps Work Team D or all the entire improvements project could be a bit of assistance on the schedule.

The reason I had asked earlier about to what extent the ALAC was actually going to consider these things in you know real time before the meeting is that, and I'm looking for your correction to my own thinking, is it 45 minutes right now? I believe it is. It seems too long for the Work Team simply to hand a piece of paper listing all of the proposals, but it seems, as you pointed out Olivier, not enough time, by any means, to actually decide on the proposals.

Should we adjust that amount of time in any way, or should -- do you think there will be enough discussion, just by handing them over and -- to be stimulated by the hand-over at that point. Thanks.



Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Go ahead, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have yet to see the full ALAC not discuss anything, even when in fact the full ALAC has prepared the words in the first place. Therefore, the likelihood of them not discussing things of this sort of dead air silence happening, and it's all going, lovely pieces of paper, thank you so much Chairs, we'll move on now, it's very, very small.

I think leaving it at the 45 minutes is smart, and if we finish at 30, either with completion, discussion and move to an online vote, or miracle upon miracle, take however much of the 45 to put this to bed, we will raise our glasses of water and coffee and go, "Yeah, team," and that will be a good thing. If we finish early, we can always do with more time in the agenda for other things; so, no downside, but I wouldn't shrink the time.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, in fact I think it's very healthy that a 45 minute discussion takes place. If all of these recommendations came through and everyone just nodded their head, I would be rather concerned.



Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thanks, and let's move on then to other things. Okay, anybody have any questions then? Okay. Well, in that case, there being no further questions, I guess we can -- yes, we can and any questions? No, Edmon? I'm glad you're here this morning, I mean I'm impressed. I mean -- so --

[background conversation]

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, that being said, nobody is raising their hands, thank you and thanks for the call. Take care.

Audience: Thank you, Dev.

[End of Transcript]

