
COPENHAGEN – ALAC and Regional Leaders Wrap Up session
Thursday, March 16, 2017 – 11:00 to 12:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I have a report where we are in terms of quorum and regional representation?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel Liang speaking. We have reached quorum and our regions are represented.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then as soon as I can get my earphones in, I will call the meeting to order.

Sorry, I'm receiving my instructions.

Okay, thank you. This is welcome to our wrap-up session, the last formal ALAC and Regional Leaders session at ICANN 58. The agenda will be modified just slightly from what we have, because we have a couple of issues that, this one issue that wasn't put on there, and that is the determination of the process going forward with the ALAC review response.

Since the last version that was presented to this group was, or is being significantly modified, we are going to have to decide how

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.

we're going to get approval on that. Will we do it after the fact, before the fact? That's what we need to decide. So, we'll be doing that at the end of the liaison reports. And are there any other comments on the agenda? Yes?

The question Olivier was asking is, are we doing RALO reports? We are asking RALO leaders to file their reports electronically. And it will be useful if when you do that, you send a note to the ALAC list to make sure everyone has a chance to look at it, and a reminder to look at it.

All right. In terms of liaison reports, we'll be receiving at this meeting at the ccNSO, the GNSO, and the GAC liaison report. Julie Hammer is currently in a SSAC meeting and will be joining us at about 12:00, so we'll take that opportunity to have her report as we have the discussion on the EPRSP as well. It's dawned me and a number of people, thank you very much, that we do have another liaison to an ICANN body that we had not included in our current process.

And that's the liaison to the customer standing committee monitoring ICANN, currently occupied by Mohamed El Bashir. And clearly there is no opportunity to get a report at this point, but we will be integrating that into the normal liaison reports, and asking him to report on a regular basis.

Is that an action item? Sure, you can give me an action item about that.

You can give me an action item to tell Mohamed, and give Heidi an action item to make sure it's actually on the report page, or somebody on the report page. I'd like to call upon Maureen to give the first report, and I'd like to also ask that someone communicate with Cheryl, who is in the next room in the GNSO meeting, that it would be good if she was here in about 10 minutes. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. Very, very briefly, just an overview of the meeting that we actually with the ccNSO Council during the week. Of course, the main issue, of course, was the EP [inaudible] issue that they are still, I think... Although it wasn't mentioned at the meeting, I think there is still some discussion that is actually going on between the two parties, ccNSO and SSAC, about the issue of the discrepancies that they have, with their views with regards to the actual issue that they're discussing at the moment.

Yesterday, they had their council meeting, and the main issues that came out of the council meeting, for example, the first thing was to do with travel funding, and for the first time, I think they're actually going to put together a working party to,

working group to look at increasing the number of travel slots that they have.

They have 12 at the moment, I think. And there is an issue about why they have never applied before, but they do have an increasing number of underserved ccTLD areas where managers cannot afford to come to ICANN meetings, and they would like to be able to assist those managers.

So, they're going to make a request. Another interesting thing that came out of the meeting was, of course, they are do, and it was mentioned at the meeting that they are due for their own review. It's due now. But they had been considering it, and they're actually going to delay their review by at least 12 months.

So, it just means there are so many reviews going on at the moment, it would just be, [inaudible] to be adding another so they're actually delaying it. That's about it from me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone have any questions? I put myself first in the queue. Maureen, a question and a suggestion. In terms of you say they're putting together a working party to consider travel slots, is that something that is going to be able to work quickly enough

to put a comment into this budget request? Or is it targeted for a year from now?

MAUREEN HILYARD: They're actually starting the working group pretty quickly, but I'm not... I didn't like ask them if they were going to be able to make it to this, I don't think they're going to this year.

ALAN GREENBERG: Once our report, once our At-Large review report is finalized, there is a table in it of, over the last nine years of the travel slots in the various groups, and it still needs to be verified, so it's still a rough number. But once it's finished, you might want to offer that to them. I can also provide the raw data if they want to look at that.

There is no purpose in everyone doing the same work twice, it's rather tedious. Any other questions for Maureen?

We will be discussing the critical issue later on in the meeting, of course. All right, I'd like to call on Yrjö Länsipuro to report on the GAC issue, or GAC actions this week.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. Yrjö Länsipuro. As the ICANN meeting as a whole, after all of this transition years, it was a peaceful

meeting, and so it was also in the GAC. So, and one indication is that the GAC communique was there on the website already this morning. So, that sort of indicates that there were no big battles in the drafting.

So, the communique is there, out for everybody to see, and I'm not going to repeat. But I'll just first of all mention that the, we had an ALAC GAC meeting, this time. Unfortunately, it was scheduled the way that there was also an event where many had to go, so that we didn't have so many people from the ALAC there.

But anyway, the main topics there were the community names and in the last gTLD round, and what should be done to improve the situation for the next subsequent round, or whatever it's called. And the other was geographic names in the sense of names of geographic significance, mountains, rivers, whatever. On both issues, actually the GAC itself is now quite divided.

So, they have to continue on the SBAs, the community based applications. They are sending the Council of Europe report to the PDP working group for consideration, and as Alan said at the meeting, of course, I mean, we are of the same opinion. They should consider this good report but we were not able to go any further in detail, because the GAC had not had time to talk about the different recommendations in that report.

In the advice, also the advice section of the communique, it's time pretty short. The GAC spent, as usual, time on trying to define what GAC advice is, and of course, now it is clearly stated that this is consensus device, that is to say everybody agrees. The items there are, let's say all known. The items were the GAC was basically reminding the Board that they should do what GAC has already told them, when is the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and identifiers.

The IGO protections, intergovernmental organization names, the mitigation of domain name abuse, and the two-character country territory codes at the second level. I'm not going to read the advice, because that would take long time, but please go and check the communique. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Questions, comments? I'm not sure where it fits... I see, Eduardo. I'm not sure if it fits here or in our debriefing of the overall meeting, I found the GAC ALAC meeting unusual in that we actually got through five items, which is almost unheard of, partly because there were just so few comments on any of the subjects from either side.

And the question I have is, is that a sign of success or failure? I'm not sure. Are you answering that question? Otherwise I'll put you in the queue. Go ahead.

GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, NARALO. I think that one thing, Tomas Schneider's leadership on that committee is excellent. I think he does a very efficient job there. I think that we're actually simpatico on a lot of issues with the GAC. That's my analysis.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that certainly is the case, but usually people are more verbose anyway. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Eduardo for the record. I know there was a meeting of the GAC that they discuss about to consider to put a person in the NomCom, the slot they have. Do you know what happened there? Thank you.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: It's a continuing story. There are... It's also mentioned in the communique, so basically the work continues. For the criteria of that the GAC would do in this... I'm scrolling through the communique right now to find the exact wording. If you just bear with me.

Can't find it now. But anyway, briefly, GAC is sort of positively has a positive attitude to this, but they are still discussing the criteria. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else with specific questions? I have a general question one, which I'll raise, but go ahead, Javier.

JAVIER: Javier [inaudible] for the record. Just to mention that the NomCom language on the GAC communique is on page five, top.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Well, while we're still waiting for Cheryl to get here, she's in the GNSO room, may be in the middle of some critical issue. The issue of geographic names is going to come back, and currently, the GAC, as far as I can tell, is likely to be quite divided on that.

There are certainly people within the GAC who want to see absolute protection for any possible geographic name. There are other people who seem to be more of a looking for something equivalent to the trademark clearinghouse, where you can establish... You know, say you have an interest but that

doesn't give you a definitive right to either claim it or to stop someone else from claiming it.

And I think that's an issue we're going to have to weigh in on. And to be honest, I think it's an issue we're going to end up being divided on also, because it's very, very hard, especially if you are from an area where you have one of the sensitive names, to not support that concept, even if you don't support it in the other regions.

And there have been some interesting examples in this round. Obviously, dot Amazon which is, at this point, in a resolution procedure and it's not clear how that one will come out. We have examples such as dot Spa in Switzerland, which seems to have been resolve amicably. And there is a lot in between.

So, it's not a discussion that we can have unfold here, but I think sometime over the next six, eight months, we probably want to schedule some time to get a briefing on it, and then have an interesting discussion. Yes, Yrjö please.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Yeah, actually, there will be, on the 25th of April, there will be a webinar on geographic names. And then in Johannesburg, the cross community meeting, whatever, it's called on geographic names also. And the GAC is, of course, I mean, they will put

there, have their input there, and of course, so should we. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anything... Well, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, my name being taking in vein next door, obviously, you call and I come. Thank you for the opportunity just to respond to what Yrjö was just saying... It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And in the planning for this face to face aspect of what we hope will be an unconflicted opportunity in Johannesburg, to explore the issue of geographic names.

And notice, I'm no longer saying country character names, I'm saying geographic names. As top-level TLDs, and we need to be very clear we are still talking top-level TLDs, it will come out from the GNSO, subsequent procedure working group. So, the PDP working group. And we are going to also be planning some webinar activity.

And in that webinar activity, and working up to that, we will be asking for position papers and presentations, to be sent forward. So, we're going to create a preparatory before we get to the face to face in Johannesburg. So, the intention is to have a really

productive conversation. There is nothing to stop, and in fact, I want to encourage regional leaders or individuals within your membership and your ALSes, who have a position paper to respond to this call when it comes out.

It will be coming out very soon. You will have a teaser, a save the date in the public forum this afternoon, but I thought I would just take the opportunity of raising the awareness while we're talking geo regions, sorry, geographic name use, because it is something that I know impassions some of the members in some of your regions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. So, you're saying my six to eight months is a little bit sluggish.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Before April ends is where it's going to happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Good luck. Cheryl, while you're here wearing another hat, what has happened with the review of the ICANN regions? Which I know you have been intimately involved in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Why thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and I had the honor of serving as the chair of that particular committee. It has gone to the Board, and for whatever reason, we haven't had a handing down from on high. The result of it is not likely to end up with substantially different things to what you saw when you looked at the final review. But it is out of our hands, it has gone to the Board, and now you've prompted me, I may have to follow-up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll note you were the chair of the last iteration of it, and that version, if I remember correctly, was only reconstituted because of the long delay since the previous version. I hope we don't have yet another one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no. Let me... It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record again. Let me see if I can make sure I understand your question. I was referring specifically to the review of geographic regions. Is that correct? Right. Yes. The whole aim is to have things that are much faster in turn around then before.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do note that the bylaws require us to review this every three years. I believe this is the first one in 17 years, and it has taken seven years, or something like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm well aware.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not criticizing. I'm using the rest of the people in the room, I hope.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. I've got some place other to be, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. GNSO report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought it was Marilyn Cade.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Stop that. No, we have been confused from time to time. But in fact, my name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And we are currently in our GNSO wrap-up session, which luckily is next door. So, I'm only able to give you some partial reports in the flavor of the month. The results of our public meeting and activities today, some of the results you've outlined, obviously, with looking forward to this joint activity, with looking at geo regional name use.

We've also, as a council, have followed the, what is fairly important actually, two things. There is the confirmation of GNSO chair, for the co-chair for the cross community working group on new gTLD option proceedings. Something that I know that you had a particular interest in, and we're delighted to report to you all that Eric [inaudible] has been appointed as the counselor from the GNSO, to act as the co-chair there.

So, I'm comfortable that the steering of the ship will be in good hands. So, more of that good news, I'm sure, to follow out of that particular workflow. One of the things that I think was very interesting was the GNSO Council has now come up to something that you've just recently had through your At-Large Advisory Committee, and that is the perilously close with this vote, that did go through, to have the formation of the GNSO standing committee, which is going to be a selection committee.

So, there is a charter. It was modified up until, and including at this meeting, it will be a nine person selection committee, and like your selection committee, it's going to be a very set of tasks together, but what might be interesting, I was going to say, is to note now, that once this charter is published with our notes from the GNSO Council, it might be interesting to have a look at that charter and see if there is anything of particular value that you might want to look at before yours.

The only other primary business activities included, and aren't you glad you don't have to read and work out... [Inaudible] is relieved she no longer has to work with my handwriting, is it has gotten worse. You didn't think it could, at there it is, it can. We've actually found that the discussion on the internet governance... You'll notice last...

Let me read [inaudible] very briefly. There is a requirement out of our last meeting that the cross community working group on internet governance needed to put in a comprehensive review of its group in the report, and I know people around this table are very interested in that. It was deadlined for this meeting.

The report made it into the GNSO Council's reading lists, pretty much as people were getting on planes. So, instead of us having a discussion, we had a bit of an update. But one of the things that I thought was particularly interesting, is that there, with the

charter and with the update from this cross community working group, we'll be looking at it intersessional, but they're going to self-impose regular activity reporting.

And I thought if we've got a principle of this regular activity reporting, which we should watch that for our interests as well. So, even though that report would be going to council, it's probably something staff should shuffle and make sure that you're aware of. And beyond that, everything else really doesn't merit much report, because it was stuff I will publish on the Wiki page.

But it was all discussions about WHOIS or preparatory, and there was one extraordinarily important thing, which I will publish in full, and that was the special resolution where, I keep referring to it as the GNSO Council. In fact, we have resolved that for the purposes of this meeting. It is the [inaudible] council, because we've dedicated everything to Glenn. So, there is another three-page resolution of thanks, which includes changing the name for the purpose of this meeting.

So, it's something that those of you who know Glenn well will enjoy reading, and I promise to publish it in full. With that, on over to questions. I'm hoping for escape.

ALAN GREENBERG: One comment, one question. I was deeply disturbed when Jonathan Robinson announced he was going to step down as the chair, because despite the fact that he does work for Affilias, which is in a current dispute, one of the auction, the proceeds of one of the auction proceeds issue, or at least one of the auctions, I thought he was an inspired selection for that position.

I'm delighted, however, with Erica Mann as the replacement. So, I think we are in good hands on that, and I agree completely with Cheryl. Question on the standing committee, the selection committee. Is it empowered to make decisions or does it make recommendations that have to be ratified by the GNSO?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It makes recommendations, I believe, but I will double check for you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

Open the floor.

Last call before Cheryl leaves.

Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do you need me for anything else today?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't believe so. You have already provided with me input that I will share at the time on one of the other issues we'll be discussing, and other than that, enjoy the GNSO meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, at the risk of wanting to say fond farewell to some of you who may be getting on planes this afternoon, immediately after the public comment, I just wanted to thank you all for the confidence you've had in me, in putting me back in the GNSO Council room. I follow some pretty hard acts, you know, with Alan and Olivier.

But I just wanted to note for the record that I'll do my best to represent our interests as best we can. Interestingly enough, just this morning, we've been asked to specifically be involved with the organization of the blocking and scheduling for the Johannesburg meeting. So, through me, the GNSO would like to make sure that we're not creating clashes as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hallelujah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thought you might like that. Bye-bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

All right. The next item on the agenda is the unscheduled one that I said I would insert at this point, and that is the process we're going to go forward with the response to the At-Large review. We have made, the small drafting group has made moderately good process. I'm comfortable that by the end of it, we will have close to finalized the content, but not necessarily the form.

But it will not be done until at least after lunch, and possibly later. So, there is no way it can be presented to this group and ask you to read the 27 page document, and ratify it. I am not expecting any disagreement based on the comments we've had, so far, that this report will be supported, if not unanimously, then certainly by consensus.

The real question is, we're likely to have a close to final report by the middle of next week. The deadline is Friday for submission. Given the size of the report, I'm a little bit reluctant to say we will ratify it immediately, you know, with a two day consensus call or

vote. But by the magnitude of it, or rather the importance of it, I'm a little bit uncomfortable saying we ratify after the fact also.

So, I guess I would like some input here. We will be able to provide a copy, Maureen, probably by Tuesday or so. Does that sound reasonable? Yeah. Now, at that point, all of us are going to have to do, or all of us who are sufficiently dedicated, will have to do a careful read. There are inevitably going to be some editorial changes. There may be one or two substantive changes, not in, not changing the direction at all, but pointing out something that we really needed to say that we didn't say properly.

So, again, open the floor, and how do people think we should go about this? I suspect the inevitable answer is we're going to have to do a quick consensus call of does anyone have any real concerns, and then a formal vote after the fact, which you know, may be a melded way of going through it. I don't know what the order was, so I'm going to go around the room at this point. Javier.

JAVIER:

Javier [inaudible] for the record. I think Tijani was the first one to pick it up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Javier, and thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. Alan, you are speaking about substantive change, possible substantive change. Do we have an idea about them? Do you have something that you feel we need to correct? If you have that, it's better to discuss it now.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know of no changes in overall direction from the version that you have already seen, and we've spent a fair amount of time discussing. But there has been lots of words being changed. There is the potential for introducing something that people might object to, although, to be honest, I don't think there is going to be a lot of objection.

Any individual might have an objection with one particular section or two sections, I'm fully expecting that. But I don't think there is going to be anything which would cause us not to have it ratified in the long term. But at this point, it still is insufficient flux that I don't feel comfortable distributing a copy for at least another couple of days. And the changes after that, I do not expect to be substantive. Again, I'm going to around the room at this point. Javier.

JAVIER: Javier [inaudible] for the record. Same as Tijani, just to... I guess, my only concern is how substantive are the substantive changes? And I think what you're saying is that they're not really substantive. They're kind of in line of what has been discussed. And there is wording changes, and maybe some sort of addition that we will look at when it's appropriate. So, I'm okay with that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me try to characterize it once more, and then I'll ask Holly, and when we get to Maureen to confirm or deny us, as they say in the TV shows. The kind of discussions that we're having at this point are, I think it's really important that this phrase be added because it adds some power to it, or it raises, you know, it's a nuance to it.

We're not... I don't think we are anywhere near saying, on recommendation three, we said we refused it, but now we're accepting it, or something like that. You know, it's all about what do we have to do...? Because remember, we're doing three things in this one document. We are commenting to the reviewers, with the hope of making sure that what comes out is something that will really enhance At-Large.

Number two, we're preparing a backup document so that if they don't make changes that we think are important, we can demonstrate to the operational effectiveness committee that we did go through a due process, and did raise these issues early, and number three, we are writing to the rest of the community who may choose to read our response.

So, you know, it's a matter of adding... I think this is really important, or I think this is something we shouldn't say, but I don't believe there is going to be any substantive change in the overall tone. Olivier.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. I just wanted to inform you and people around the table that the RALO document is also taking good shape, with input from all of the RALOs having been received. I have integrated four out of the five so far, and I'm in the process of including the fifth one.

I would kindly ask if the drafting team of the ALAC response could help me in smoothing out, or blending the responses also from the RALOs, so that we have homogeneity between the two statements that will be sent over.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I speak our behalf, in our abundant free time, we would be delighted.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm very glad that you have plenty of time to focus on this, so thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will note that having some differences... I mean, having the RALOs say yes to something, and us say no or vice versa, would probably not be optimal. I understand. But having subtle differences, even differences of agreement on some things, it's not a bad thing. It shows we really did do this from the bottom-up process. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche for the transcript. I just would really like to underline what Alan said. We have had lots of sessions, the last session that we had, I took notes. Maureen took notes. Ariel took notes. And I spent the best part of yesterday, late morning, early afternoon, putting everything that everybody said onto one document that we've actually gone through.

So, for everybody, I would like to assure you that the comments that have been made, have been noted, have been taken

account of. Now, not necessarily accepted, but if not accepted it's usually because it's repetition, it's said elsewhere, but in terms of substance, what the document now has and will have, is a reflection of everything I've heard.

I will be surprised, and probably saddened, if there are any new comments, given that we have had, this is the second, probably the second full-time for discussion, for listening to everybody, and everybody has had a lot of time before then.

So, we've listened very carefully. We've taken notes very carefully. And the document you have will reflect the care and attention that four or five of us have taken. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I will point out that we've had enough versions that I was having trouble juggling three and four of them on my screen, that I have now been accused of being solely responsible for global warming in the printing of several copies of these documents. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. The first half of my intervention will be in French, and then I will speak in English because I need to use certain terms. We are not all equal when we are face with the challenge of today. And I am not 100% certain that the 15

members of ALAC, the elected members, are concerned by the entire document, or are aware of the entire document.

And I think that we need a little bit of time to read it. The second thing I wanted to say is after what happened yesterday, and the discussions that I had with the staff teams in charge of the reviews and of the modifications that were brought to the document, I think it would be good to have a separate, small document that talks about the review process itself. The way that the review was done, because I was asked yesterday, what can we do to fix things?

And what I answered is that the only solution is that the items team draft a document that indicates exactly what they found out through their research, the outcome of their research, that we talk about the document, and that their proposals might be to the creation of another document that we can discuss afterwards.

The second thing is that I am quite surprised by the way that they really are very, very faithful to their proposal. How is it possible that four people, who are indeed smart, might be smarter than a group, a larger group of people who have experienced all of this, and have lived things through?

...they can in saying the one who are, I don't remember, concerned, or who have... We all have the time we have to do

the work, and you can't say that there are people, if they don't [inaudible] because they are not doing right their job. We are not all in the same situation with work, with family, with whatever, travel, and so on.

Then if some of us are not able to do this part of the job, it's not the reason to say that it's because they are not really engaged in the work we are doing. And I really want you to be careful in how you talk about the work done by the member of our group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'm not trying to respond to everything as we go along, I'll save my comments, but I will respond to that last one. If indeed I said, and I may well have, that if people don't have the time to fully review the document next week, it's because they're not concerned, I misspoke, and I'm sorry of that.

Clearly, I've not reviewed 25 and 50 page documents plenty of times, even though I wanted to, because the situations just don't allow it, so my apologies if I implied that. Seun is next.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah, this is Seun for the record. I had my card up, just to confirm if anything in terms of the high level decision we had about the recommendations were changing, but it looks like

you've already confirmed that so that I dropped my card, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Seun. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking.

So, in French as well. I attended a session this morning, a GNSO setting, the SCSG session. I didn't necessarily want to be involved in what they do, but I am a member of the CSP, the chairing program, or I can't remember exactly what the acronym is, but I was working on the process, not necessarily on the content.

But I had to listen to what they had to say. And so, there was a question that was asked of the Board members. And the Board member that was present was the Swiss Board member. What is his name again? Marcus. And the question was related to the At-Large review. And what Marcus said is the following.

He said that he was sorry to see that unfortunately people focused on the recommendations without addressing the analysis and the evaluation of the problems identified. Of course, it is a point of view that is inaccurate, especially coming

from a Board member, especially since we explained to them specifically that we did indeed study the analysis, study the review. And that we do agree with most of what they ended up with, however, the recommendations do not necessarily relate to the issues that they are supposed to solve.

And so, what I would like to propose, in our answer, is that we start, I'm not quite sure where or how in our response, but maybe to say that this is the analysis, we agree with this, we don't agree with that. And then, we talk about the recommendations so that people are aware that we are, indeed, taking into account both the analysis, and the recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG:

So, if I may summarize so that we can note. You're suggesting that we explicitly identify somewhere that we agree, either we agree with some and don't agree with others, or identify... For instance, I think it's a given, we agree with the need for more engagement. We don't agree that we have a very significant turnover problem.

Yeah, we have some turnover problem, but that... I'm not saying those are the, are what we write. I'm saying that kind of delineation is what you're asking for.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am asking for putting in the report, very clearly and perhaps at the beginning of the report, the enumerating the elements of the analysis and of the evaluation, and say, at each time, we are okay with this, we are not okay with this. So, we are aware of the analysis and of the evaluation, and we are aware of the problems. And we agree with most of them, and then we speak about the recommendation.

We take the recommendation [inaudible], as we did.

ALAN GREENBERG: The drafting will factor that in as we go forward with it. I see your hand, you're noted. Next we have Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Alan. First of all, I would like to thank Olivier for the RALO reports, the summary which has been prepared. I'd like to emphasize, reemphasize what Alan point out, that uniformity is not necessarily a desirable kind of thing, when you compare to this to... At-Large is large.

It is diverse. It contains multitudes. There will be some differences, and that's perfectly fine, and we should not kind of

iron out this differences to kind of achieve uniformity. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I've closed the queue. Yeşim.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Yeşim Nazlar, ICANN staff. We have two questions in the AC chatroom, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. The first question is, can the call next week, to review the text and the ratification by the ALAC happen before the deadline of March 24? And the second question is, should the ALAC request an extension to the public comment? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't aware a call was scheduled next week. Is it? That's something I think the working party needs to discuss very quickly. Olivier, I had closed the queue. No, I have the speaker queue at this point is, Yrjö, Maureen, and Holly, and we are starting to run out of time, significantly, so I ask for brief comments, please.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, thank you, Alan. Yrjö Länsipuro speaking. Yeah, I hope that the, our replies take issue with the way the process is run by

items. I think that's what Sébastien said also here, because not only that the recommendations were put at this stage, were they suggest, talk about problems.

They are actually designed the whole system, ready for us, how it's built, case in hand, and I see that he would accept that that's something as from consultants, and I'd been a consultant myself, that's something that is totally unacceptable.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Before we go on to our next two speakers, several of the comments that were made, we've now had a second suggestion on the review process. I'll note at the opening Board ALAC meeting yesterday, Rinalia announced that the OEC has already decided that the process that we're going through will never be done again.

That the process will be the consultants recommend, or identify problems, and going forward, that is the review process, the external review process. So, certainly on our critical path in getting a comment made, I don't think we need to comment on that.

The queue at this point is Maureen, Holly, and I understand Olivier wanted to talk about the RALO ratification, and I'll give

you a moment to talk about that. And then I'll try to summarize and propose a way forward. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. Maureen for the record. I'm just going back to some of the earlier comments, and just to reassure everyone that the editing team has been working very productively on the document. And we've basically going through it line by line. So, we are ensuring that a lot of the things that we're probably, that we were at odds with, to start off, we're all on the same line.

But also just to comment on Sébastien's comment about the reviewers loyalty to the recommendations that they made. I think some of the comments that were actually sort of like been given lately is that their loyalty to their recommendations may be wavering a bit, which means that, you know, one of the things that we've got to make sure are the things that we think very strongly back are really reinforced within the document, and that's something that we're going to take really strongly. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would not presume any of their determination is wavering at this point. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, just to respond. Just a little bit briefly. Tijani, a lot of the text that is there, is already in response to what they say. We also have an executive summary, in which we have since most documents should have an executive summary, that's all that people read. There will be a summary about basically the methodology, but one of the things that we have emphasized based on what we're going to do anyway, but what's now important, is to look at the things that they've identified as issues and respond to them.

And that's sort of the path that we'll be taking. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, you said you had some information to provide?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very short information. Yesterday, [inaudible] was with us, he was the vice-chair of the committee that was in charge of the reviews, and he said that it wasn't a decision of the Board. It was a proposal of the committee of the Board. So, it is not yet official.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is the position of the committee. Thank you very much. Olivier, again, briefly.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And just wanting to ask one quick question from our RALO chairs. Once the RALO document is finalized, it would be good for each of the five RALOs to ratify it. I know that each RALO uses its own procedures. We have a very short amount of time to ratify the document. So, please be alert next week on your emails.

Don't just take a weekly holiday, and then we pass the deadline for filing the statement with the public consultation if we do. And we are missing a RALO ratification, that would really be a problem. That's it, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm told we'll have no interpretation next week, so really don't have the opportunity to do an At-Large wide webinar on it. Question for Maureen. I'm giving you a warning, I'm asking you a question. How comfortable do you feel that by the end of today, we distribute a copy to the internal At-Large list, which is the ALAC regional leaders and the other people on the working party with the clear caveat that this is not final?

We do not want editing comments and things like that, but we do want red flags raised if the people see something really wrong. Do you feel comfortable giving them another couple of days? That essentially means people can look at it on their way home, if nothing else.

MAUREEN HILLYARD:

Well, I know that's basically what we're aiming to do that you should have something before you leave. And we're over halfway, I think in our deliberations of the sections that we're going through. I think most of the latter part of the paper is actually sort of like quite a lot more straightforward than some of the earlier recommendations.

And I'm, yeah, I'm pretty confident you will get something, if not... Well, maybe, it depends on how late tonight we'll keep working on it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have people leaving today and early tomorrow, so the sooner we can get something out, I think the better, and understand it will still have comments to the editors in it. It will still have unaccepted changes that are being discussed. But if we want to get you something with an extra couple of days, then that's what it will be.

I'm guessing, and Maureen confirmed before, we should, by Tuesday have a much cleaner version. And I think at that point, we'll probably put that cleaner version on a Google Doc that anyone can comment on, and we'll identify at that point... At that point, we will want punctuation and things like that noted, just because it's getting very, very close to the final.

Does that sound like a path forward? We haven't talked about ratification yet, but in terms of availability of it, does that sound reasonable? Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think it's a good idea if it can be done, and if it's done, can you provide on Tuesday two documents? One clean, one for the people who didn't read the previous version, and one compiling the one you will give us tonight or tomorrow morning with the final one, is that people who have, will read the two version will have just to go through the change, since the last time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Understand though, that we're doing this editing on Google Docs, which means, to get the redline, we will have an automated word version of the redline, which means it's a little bit ugly, but it does show you the differences. So, as long as you

forgive us for that, that's fine. Any other comment on that way in terms of distributing documents? Yeşim, go ahead.

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Yeşim Nazlar, ICANN staff. We have two questions in the AC chat from [inaudible]. The first one is, if the process has to change, can the ALAC and the RALOs contribute in its proposal and implementation? Do you have to comply to the model proposed by the consultant without any changes?

And the second question is, how much time do you have to comply to the change the process? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, a very brief summary. We've done this several times, but I guess we have people on this call. In terms of changing the review process, anyone can comment to the Board and Board members, and they probably will actually [inaudible] public comment. So, that's not on our tight timeline, in terms of how we carry out this review, we are submitting comments as well as other people.

The reviewers will look at all of the comments with a final version of the report. That will then go to the At-Large working party, and that implicitly means will be available to the leadership group within At-Large. We will then essentially pass

judgment on it, and say yes, we agree, this should be implemented. Now, we have some reservations about it, or no, we believe this would be dangerous to implement.

If you look at the GNSO comparable document, they actually flag things and break red or bright green, don't remember if they had a yellow or orange for an in between one. And then it goes to the operational effectiveness committee, they decide whether to accept the recommendations of the consultant, or whether to what extent they agree with our interpretation, and then that goes to the Board.

Conceivably the Board could tell us to do everything the consultant said, regardless of whether we think it's reasonable. I find it rather hard in this day of accountability in ICANN if that were going to happen, but it's not against the rules, but other than that, we're now predicting how it will unfold. In terms of timeframe, we're expecting to get the report well before June.

We are probably expected to get something into the operational effectiveness committee by round about September. And how quickly they act on it, we have no control. Okay. The next question is, ratification. And what I would propose is we set a deadline, probably no later than the end of next Wednesday, for people raising any issues which would cause them to reject the final paper, but do a formal ratification by vote after the fact.

Does that sound reasonable to people? I'm doing a straw poll of the room essentially. Can we take that down as a formal action item? So, we're not losing it. Assuming we distribute a copy on Tuesday, we will give people about 24 hours, maybe 36, to raise any red flags, and presuming there are no significant ones from a large number of people, again, any given ALAC member can say I don't agree with this.

We don't need unanimity in everything we try for. It would be really nice if we had unanimity on this particular issue, but if we don't, we don't. And then we would do a formal vote, a ratification vote, after the fact. And if we can also note down the action items, our intent is to distribute a copy later today, if at all possible, knowing it's rough, and then another copy, much cleaner on round about Tuesday.

So, if we have captured all of that, shouldn't you have a comment? Go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

This is Seun for the record. I just wanted to note that, at least we should note that minimum of 36 Rs, irrespective when it is sent, [inaudible] to be provided for checking the document. So, if it happens, we don't meet up on Tuesday, then it means that it needs to be extended.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Noted, but the, at this point, the current deadline is absolute. Now, the question was raised of should we request an extension, I'll talk about that in a moment, so yes, if at all possible, but if we have significant problems getting that version out, 20, 36 hours may be difficult, but yes, that is certainly our target.

Now, thoughts on requesting an extension? I'll note a couple of things, the reviewers have candidly said, they've already put a lot more time into this than they've contracted for, and I don't doubt that. Extending the comment period also extends the period in terms of calendar months that they are engaged in this.

And I'm not sure the quality of their work goes up, if we push them very far past that. and I'm not feeling sorry for them, I'm being very pragmatic that we want as high quality as possible out of this, we want them to actually focus on this. So, I personally would prefer not to see an extension.

The most we would need is a day or two, and to be quite honest, if we miss the whole thing by a day, given it ends on Friday at midnight, I'm not going to feel all that bad if we get it on Saturday. I'm not targeting that, but if they refuse to accept it based on that, then I think we have a separate issue. So, I don't think we want a formal extension, although we may say

informally, you know, agreement on all parties that Monday will be as good as Friday.

And if we get that agreement, we'll let you know. Any further comments? We are very late on the agenda. Seeing nothing, thank you. I think we have some decisions on that. We had 15 minutes to talk about the ALS communication program. I don't think we really have that anymore. I was going to use that, to some extent, after we had that discussion, there was a bit of a flurry on the various mailing lists about why didn't we talk to various committees about it?

Why hasn't this been circulated to RALOs? And I think the short answer is the overall proposal, the concept was approved in Hyderabad, and was very public. It has been made available on public lists. The call for members to, of the ad-hoc committee to do the further enhancement again, was a very public thing, and has people from all RALOs represented, including a fair number of regional leaders and people on other committees, and there was certainly no prohibition on distributing things.

So, although I fully believe that there are lots of people who weren't aware of what's going on. I think we did a reasonable job, and we haven't approved anything yet. So, I apologize if things didn't hit all the right mailing lists at the right time. This is all being done in parallel with the At-Large review, and the At-

Large review has taken unreasonable amount of time from people's schedules. So, everything has been delayed.

So, to the extent that my delays caused other people angst, I'm sorry. But I think there has been plenty of opportunity for input from RALOs in our various working groups, and there will be more as we go forward. How are we on time at this point? We're a little after 12.

We have about 30 minutes. We have a substantive discussion, I think, with Julie as soon as she gets here. Julie is here, okay. I will take 10 minutes, but not more, to for a debriefing while things are fresh. And I guess I would like to say, this has been a horrendous meeting to schedule from those of us who have been doing the detailed At-Large scheduling.

The number of conflicts, for many of us, I think have reached an all-time high, and at least the perception of my schedule, and I guess I would like some brief input from the point of view of the At-Large meetings, have they been productive? Did we waste a lot of time, in your mind? And perhaps identify which sessions are the worst and which are the best. If you found problems with my chairing, I'm receptive to that. Perhaps you may not want to do it in the public forum, but it's your call.

And to the extent that people are unhappy with how we've done things, I encourage you, as we go forward, to get involved in it.

We've spent a fair amount of time on teleconferences talking about schedules. We get virtually no feedback at any time. So, anyway. I open the floor. Let's take no more than 10 minutes, and if we can have one minute timers please. Leon?

LEON:

Thanks, Alan. As part of the planning team, I agree that has been very challenging to actually manage to pulling in all of the meetings that we need to do in the schedule. So, I know that what I'm about to say may be sensitive to the RALOs especially, but I would suggest that especially in the B meeting, which is the policy forum that we're about to have in Johannesburg, we encourage the RALOs to not hold monthly meetings at the ICANN meeting.

I think that we can continue to have the monthly meetings of the RALOs as a teleconference, either before, as preparation to the policy forum, or as a follow-up of the policy forum after it happens. So, I would really like to encourage RALO leadership to try to consider, at least not having these monthly meetings at any ICANN meetings at all.

I would actually encourage only maybe a meeting of the RALO in which the ICANN meeting is actually happening, because that I can see the value in it. But [CROSSTALK]... Yes, sorry. If we're

having a meeting in Africa, I don't see how having a LACRALO meeting adds value to the overall schedule.

So, I just put this on the table so that the RALO leadership can consider it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We are going to be using a one minute timer, I've said no alarm, but I will be an alarm, if necessary. We now have the speaker list right now is Sébastien, Alberto, Tijani, Garth, and Seun. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I agree with what Leon just said, and I'm in charge of all of those changes, the different types of meeting, and I would like to go back to two things that are important. We need to have more time, all of us to go see the way the other works, and participate in the work of others, because we're like a fortress. We are in our corner, and we did not leave it, and not the big mouth of ALAC, not only those, but everybody from At-Large should go see the other groups.

And we have a very interesting presentation coming from Holly on RDS, on those data, and we should do it, those RDS data. We should have a webinar about it, and not do it here. Here, we have to debate issues. I know it's difficult, but if we don't want

to waste time during our meetings, or the presentation, information, training, should be done before.

ALAN GREENBERG: ...interrupt. Could we please do the alarm? We have a speaker list. The speaker list is now closed. We have Alberto, Tijani, Garth, Seun, Alan, and Satish. I don't think I've missed anyone. I hope I've not missed anyone. Alberto, go ahead, one minute with alarm.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. I think those that those who are involved in activities that they're not dependent as, that is because of ICANN's scheduling, are justified to be late and not to be actively involved, etc. But then many of us are not. I mean, many of us do not... I mean, we need to start on time, we need to end on time, and this is how we can make the most of the meetings here.

Everything is expensive here, so we have no coffee, and you know, and so many other things because it has taken very long here in the meetings.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Next we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani speaking. When we prepared our meeting with the Board here, you remember, Alan, we listed six bullet points. Those are the topics of interest in At-Large that we presented to the Board, and we decided during the preparation to change the fourth one, from gTLD to TLD. And it hasn't been changed, which made us ridiculous because people asked us, you don't care about the [inaudible] for the IDN ccTLD?

They are right because we're not talking about ccTLD at all, because this G, before the gTLD. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: You are correct, and I won't go into the details of why at this point. Aziz, the queue is closed. We're really out of time. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Quickly. Garth Bruen. I've been personally affected by some of these scheduling issues, one of them was that a presentation that I've been preparing for weeks, the meeting that the presentation occurred in wasn't even on the schedule. I have no idea. It was obliterated from the schedule. And when I read the titles for certain meetings, especially this one, I assume that members of our community are going to get a chance to speak, but then we arrive at the meeting and we see that the

queue is completely blocked full of people who are speaking to us.

And I wonder sometimes if this is intentional, because we have members of the Board who don't want to hear internet users. And the memo that I put forward about the compliance system not being functional, this is the kind of work that we should all be presenting.

This is the kind of work that everybody should be bringing from their own communities and being spoken about at an ALAC wrap-up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. For the record, these agendas are set based on input we get. If we don't get input, we don't always have full discretion. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. This is the Seun for the record. I just wanted to make a suggestion as looking for future meeting planning, especially in regards to policy participation in policy development. I'm wondering if, since we have good news from Cheryl that we now, they're planning together with the GNSO, it may be good to look for high interest policy topics that we can make sure to block off our own RALO, or ALAC activities, so that

we can be sure that we have the participation in that particular meeting.

And if we can meet before the meeting, that particular policy meeting to brief people who are ALAC or At-Large members who are actually in the physical meeting, before they go into that particular policy session, so that it can be more useful when they contribute to the discussion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Seun. One of the problems is there was significant community involvement, including the RALO chairs, in setting up the block schedule. But once the block schedule is firm, each of the AC SOs submit their individual requests, and they start getting populated an internal database.

Now, Gisella does an admirable job of looking at everything and trying to see where she thinks there may be overlaps, and to try to make sure we adjust our schedule to cover that, or get them to adjust theirs. But that's a limited thing. And since other people are making changes at the last moment, we're suddenly then confronted with a final schedule which may have very significant conflicts, and that's a real challenge of how do we do that or how do we fix that.

We're then confronted with an issue of rigidity that absolutely no flexibility, even when it's clear that some change is made. So, it is certainly a challenge. Satish, last comment.

SATISH BABU:

Satish for the record. Thank you, Alan. This is on Leon's request for kind of moving the RALO meetings. While I understand fully the kind of conflicts that exist today or the difficulties on scheduling these things. As far as the RALOs are concerned, we normally put off decisions until we have a face to face meeting.

Because it's pretty hard to have a decision making process in the fullest sense over the telephone calls. So, normally we kind of defer everything so that we have a face to face opportunity. Now, we can be very flexible about this. We can, I personally don't have any problems in working early or late or whatever.

But I would request that you consider some kind of flexible arrangement for this. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think in general, if you're in your own region, and you're expecting a lot of people to participate, I think it's a very different situation then if really it's only the RALO and ALAC leadership that is there, then a face to face meeting can be in a

bar or restaurant or something like that. So, we may have to be more flexible like that, because again, flexibility is the key.

If we're asking for flexibility from the rest of the organization, I think we have to experience it ourselves. Thank you very much. Is there an interest in devoting some time on a future ALAC meeting to continuing this discussion?

I see one or two people saying yes. Is there any objection to doing it on a future ALAC meeting? No, okay. If we can note an action item to do that. Julie Hammer, report from the SSAC, and we will, immediately after the report, going into a discussion of the EPSRP, I think, and whether the ALAC wants to change its position on it. Aziz, you wanted to make a comment?

AZIZ:

Just one minutes. En français. Yes, I would like to repeat what I said this morning during the SO AC leader meeting, regarding to schedule Johannesburg on the 25, 26, 27 June, the beginning of the Johannesburg meeting, is the end of Ramadan for the Muslim people, extremely important, and I think that ICANN should be very, very careful about that.

I would like to officially say it to ICANN. We are a world-wide organization, with all religions being present, and we have to be careful about those dates, about those important religious

events. I'm afraid that many ALSes, representatives from ALSes, would be able to travel during that meeting, during the end of Ramadan.

Secondly, another issue regarding the States. When we have many, many travels going on, and I think the participants will be, we have a hard time reserving their flights and accommodation.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't know what I can say other than to agree. The dates have been published for a fair amount of time. It's rather unfortunate that no one has waved this red flag before today, or before this week...

No, no, I don't think we can get into this discussion in detail at this point, and certainly it's not something that we have control over. We have a Board member, we should tell our Board member that. It's a Board member who maybe actually particularly sympathetic to this particular issue. So, no, no, our current Board member. Julie?

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks Alan. And really the fact... Julie Hammer speaking for the record. I'm really only going to talk about APSRP, the extended process similarly review panel for fast track ccTLDs, IDN ccTLDs. Because this topic has been occupying the

intention of many SSAC members throughout the whole week, and indeed, for some months.

So, what I'd like to do is just give you the current situation, as I understand it. Patrick came and talked to us on Sunday, and explained... I'm not sure if all ALAC members were in the room for his explanation, but he explained the concerns that the SSAC has regarding the currently proposed ccNSO guidelines for the evaluation of confusingly similar strings in IDNs.

And the three issues that he highlighted was that the current proposal says that if uppercase and lowercase are evaluated, and if one is confusingly similar, and the other not, then the lowercase should take precedent. What the SSAC believes is that that is not advisable, because if either are confusingly similar, than that is the judgment that should be made, and the outcome of the evaluation process, because you simply can't say to the bad guys, hey bad guys, you know, uppercases are confusing, so please don't use it.

When you're using your domain names to do dastardly deeds, please just stick to the lowercase in these IDNs, it just doesn't happen that way. So, that was the first point. The second point is that the ccNSO in the proposed process have used a particular interpretation of RFC 6912, which is an internet architecture board technical advice, or technical document.

And the SSAC has interpreted that same document in a different way. So, what the SSAC is saying is that rather than the ccNSO and the SSAC debate whose interpretation of the document is correct, that we should all actually go back to the architecture Board and ask them, in this context, what is the correct interpretation of your document?

And that is actually happening. Any of you in the public forum the other day would have heard Andrew Sullivan speak to this point, and he, Andrew, who is the chairman of the internet architecture board, and one of the authors of RFC 6912, has actually sent a letter to the ccNSO clarifying the intended meaning of that RFC in this context.

The third point that Patrick made, that the SSAC is concerned about, is that when there is confusing similarity, but when the confusingly similar ccTLDs may be delegated within the same registry, if there is a proposal that risk mitigation can be undertaken within the registry by policy decisions on restrictions on how those confusingly similar strings may be used, then you...

Those proposed policy frameworks must be included as part of the evaluation of risk, and not something that happens afterwards. You can't actually assess the risk in the absence of

knowing what those policy frameworks, and so that's the third point.

So, they're the technical issues and there is no question that this is exceedingly complex and exceedingly difficult to understand, and I have to confess to you that I've struggled for a long time now to work my way through this document to try and get my mind around some of these issues.

So, I know that some of you really do understand these issues. And if some of you are still struggling, please understand that you're in a very large group. So, where are we at the moment? So, yesterday, a couple of people from the ICANN Board, and the ccNSO and the SSAC got together and I believe that a lot of progress has been made in clarifying understanding in working towards an appropriate way forward.

The Board wants clarification from the ccNSO on the three issues that I've just gone through, and they're going to be writing to the ccNSO requesting them to clarify their position on these three issues that SSAC have raised. The Board is not going to discuss this issue until their May Board meeting, so there is not going to be any decisions made in the interim.

The IAB are going to clarify some of those complex issues about the RFC even further, I understand. So, it's really up to ALAC to take that as the current situation, and to have the discussion

about what you feel is appropriate. I will point out that was very unfortunate that the ALAC advice and support for the ccNSO position, which was understandable in the circumstances, it being such a complex technical issue, that advice, unfortunately, preceded the publishing of the SSAC advice by only seven days.

And I was unaware of, until too late, of what the SSAC advice was going to be, because I hadn't been on that particular work party. So, I do apologize, that had I prior warning, I would have certainly fed that into the ALAC's decision making process had I been able to. So, I'll leave it at that, Alan, and over to you to take the discussion further.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I have a speaker's queue at this point of Yeşim, Alan, Holly, and Maureen, and Seun. We have a... And Alberto. We have 10 minutes to do this, and I would actually like to come to a vote, or a consensus call on this, so I ask people to be exceedingly brief. We'll put up a one minute timer with alarm, but please try to only use half of it. Yeşim.

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Thank you. Yeşim Nazlar, ICANN staff. We have a comment in the AC chat from Dev Anand Tellucksingh. He says, one observation regarding the naming of our sessions are often for

ALAC and regional leaders working session number. This doesn't [inaudible] very well for getting outside persons interested in attending. We should perhaps look to... Sorry.

We should perhaps look to give these sessions a more descriptive name. The example is like, At-Large community security and stability issues. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think that is somewhat out of scope for this particular discussion, but noted for future advice. I'm going to take myself out of the queue at this point, because I have a proposal to make, but I would like to hear other people first. Next we have Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. Holly Riache for the transcript records. It's very simple and short. I probably approve the proposal. I'm aware that our letter supports ccNSO, I believe we need to actually modify what we have to say in some kind of official statement, I don't think we should propose a solution, but I think we should say two things.

Number one, we represent the interests of the users of the internet, and thus establishing our right to say something, or the interests of which we speak. And therefore, we have been made

aware by briefings from the SSAC that there is likely confusion, which is our concern. And rather than propose any particular solution, say we would strongly urge both parties to resolve the difference in the interest of end users. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Holly. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, this is Seun for the record. I like to know that it's interesting that SSAC also has a working parties. I hope you're doing reviews on, if you do.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

When I got the brief from the ccNSO meeting we have. I feel really [inaudible] and convinced that interaction, and I personally would just suggest that we let it be. The way it is, and let's [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The queue is closed. I note that they currently are using our support as one of the strong rationales for why the Board should approve it. If we no longer have that support, we do need to correct that. Alberto.

All right. Seeing no other comments, even though they usually show up after I close the queue. Maureen was up, I didn't write it down. I'm sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, I agree with other comments that have been made. I think that, for example, in order to justify our original vote, which was based on, at that time, as you say, Julie, the SSAC explanation came after. And we were basing it on the ccNSO's interpretation of the RFC, which apparently does need clarification.

So, that's been worked on. And I think that the fact that they're actually still continuing the dialogue in that, and that other, like the IAB is becoming involved. I think I'd like to let them sort some out. I don't think we need to change. But I don't think...

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you saying...? To be clear, you're saying we should let our support of this, our unilateral support of this ccNSO proposal stand?

MAUREEN HILYARD: What I'm saying is that I don't think we should make any, you know, that we should actually let them know that our decision is also awaiting the result of their discussions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And the proposal I have, and this is not wordsmithed [sic]. So, if we agree in principle, we'll have to wordsmith it, and make sure that with consultation of the right technical people, we get the right words, which I don't have. But the high points would be, the ALAC has strong concern over user confusion. The ALAC has a strong desire to see IDN TLDs deployed.

Since there seems to be a way forward, which will not lower confusion evaluation standards, and will factor in mitigation to allow the ccTLD IDNs to be deployed, the ALAC rescinds its previous comment, and encourages all parties to come to agreement, which maintains the standards and allows deployment of the ccTLDs to be rewarded as necessary.

Sorry?

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'm saying that they should be clarifying the standard as well, because I think there is the fact that there are two interpretations of the RFC standardization.

HOLLY RAICHE: I would object to that simply because I've asked for Patrick, and he specifically does not want us to work through how to solve the problem. What he wants is two things. Withdraw our letter of support, and two, to say we strongly encourage resolution. He doesn't want us to tell them how to do it. Okay? That was my conversation last breakfast.

ALAN GREENBERG: My feeling is we should be as un-prescriptive as possible, so the parties can resolve things. Julie, I see your card. As un-prescriptive as possible, so we can allow the parties to come to a reasonable cooperative joint conclusion. And I don't, I'm not sure we're really in a position to prejudge, but I think we're making our standard that both potential confusion and IDNs are important to us.

We have no doubt that in the situations on the table right now, the parties will deploy all of the necessary mitigation. There is no guarantee that the next requester will be so honorable, and therefore we want the process to work properly. Tijani, did you want to make a comment?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. I do agree and support your way of answering, of moderating our answer,

because I am absolutely against the mention of the difference of interpretation between ccNSO and SSAC, of the RFC. I don't think that we have to go in this deep first, and I think that the most important thing for the users is the uppercase, lowercase problem.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We have about two minutes left in the session. I'm told we have five minutes of interpretation. So, I will turn it over to Julie, and then I will propose exactly what we do next. Julie.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Alan. Julie Hammer speaking. Alan, the last words that you used in your proposal was to allow the deployment of the ccTLDs, I think that could be a little problematic. I think what we really need to try and achieve is to allow the appropriate risk assessment of the ccTLDs, because it might be that taking all things into consideration, that the risk is in a particular circumstance, deemed to be too high to enable deployment.

So, I don't think we should be specifying that the outcome be that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. That wasn't the intent. I will try to reword something in the next few days, where I will now then put out a consensus call for this group, and once we get general agreement, we'll try to get it refined to make sure the words are bullet proof. I think we're mostly in agreement here.

Is everyone comfortable going forward? Alberto has a very short comment. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. I would suggest to use the term predictive risk against corrective risk, because as Julie said, things should be done before happening and not afterwards. The corrective risk is already done. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I think that was the implicit understanding in any case, but I will let the experts control what the words are. But yes, I think that was certainly the intent. We have a way to move forward. In that case, we now have a 10 minute wrap-up in the next minute or two.

I found this, personally, an exceedingly exhausting meeting. But I think we have actually accomplished an awful lot, and I feel better about the outcome of this meeting than I have for a while. I don't know how anyone else feels, but I thank you for your

attention. We are going to have to get a lot better at actually starting meetings at the right time.

I think we set a record here, we started a 30 minute session 25 minutes into it this time. We're going to have to get just a little bit better than that, maybe a lot better, but in general, I was also pleased that there are a number of people who were at the table at the starting time every single time.

And for those of you who did that, and there weren't a lot of you, but you know who you are, I thank you. I think it has been an exhaustive meeting for everyone. I think it has been a good meeting. I welcome your comments private, public, and any form on how we can make these better. And Seun would like a comment before we close.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay, sorry. I was thinking that there was going to be an AOB. I discussed with the [inaudible] yesterday, and they said they were open and available, willing to come to us to give us updates if we request for it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Then I suggest you remind us when we start asking for what we do for the next meeting. Any further comments before we have a few acknowledgements as we close? Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And as someone who, as you well know, [inaudible] has been in the room with you, I just wanted to make sure that you all recognized how much easier it was for me to be attached to this room, via the Adobe Connect room and my mobile phone, running on Wi-Fi, because of the fabulous job that, you know, obviously, [inaudible] and the team have done.

When there was interpretation, I was getting English on the English channel, the whole time. And I think we're getting further along, so I didn't miss what Alberto was saying. And that makes a difference. That isn't the way it used to be. This is becoming more and more professional, and I just wanted to recognize that before you went on to thank yous.

Because this is all about making it easier to participate and lowering barriers to entry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, thank you. And I wasn't in a single room this week that I couldn't use my earphones. So, any further comments before we close up? Then I would like to thank every one of you for being here, for contributing. It has been a really good

meeting. I don't think there was anyone who just sat there and didn't do anything, which occasionally happens.

And we've been really, really good about keeping to timers and keeping interventions short. You're not perfect, but neither am I. So, I thank you all for that.

Sorry. Heidi has an announcement to make. I can't read her writing, so she's going to make the announcement.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Well, two announcements then while I have... Really quickly. Number one is that, it's important, the AFRALO General Assembly will be held in ICANN 59 in Johannesburg. So, there will be about 48 AFRALO ALSes, just to note there. And just final comment, dinner at 8 tonight.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That comment I will allow. And I hope most people will be able to join us. I'd like to... I'd like to thank our wonderful staff. [Applause]

I'm talking right now about the At-Large staff, who put up with us, and meet pretty much all of our completely unreasonable demands. Thank you very much for the time and effort. If you're

taking half a day off, which is as much as we allow you right now, do enjoy it.

And I can't say more good words about the group. I would like to thank our technical people at the back of the room.
[Applause]

I'll say something that I've said before at a number of meetings. A few years ago, there were infinite problems with microphones, and sound systems, and remote participation. Nowadays, every once in a blue moon, there is a little problem, but in most rooms, we just don't even think about it because everything works.

And not only that, At-Large rooms have enough microphones that everyone can speak. Those of you who go back a few years might remember that the GNSO or the Board room would be setup like this, but the ALAC room would be setup with two microphones on each table or something like that, so we're finally making the big time. Thank you very much.

Aziz has his hand up before I can make my last thank you. Go ahead, Aziz.

AZIZ:

I just wanted to remind you of something. Heidi mentioned the 48 ALSes, and we are going to put together capacity building sessions, between eight and nine. And it was mentioned in the

morning, and I would like for the ALAC room not to be busy with anything throughout the week, because we will need it. So, just to mention that.

ALAN GREENBERG: We will, of course, be factoring in all considerations. That means I'm not making any promises, but clearly it's one of the things we'll look at. And lastly, before people pack up, I would like to thank our wonderful interpretation team. [Applause]

Again, as I've said before, the quality of the interpretation, no matter what buzzwords and weird language we through at them, is just superb. And every time we say can we please have 5, or 10, or 15 more minutes, the answer is almost invariably yes, thank you very much for your great service.

This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]