

---

ABU DHABI – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 9

Sunday, October 29, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:45 GST

ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Sunday, October 29, 2017 in Hall B Section A ALAC for the ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 9, 15:15 to 16:45.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can people in the room please take their seats? Can we please ask to have the people outside brought in? We would like to start.

All right, if we can start the recording and start the session, please. Let me know when we're ready. Can you let me know when we're ready to start? We ready to start. Okay, thank you.

Welcome back to ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session #9. Almost double digits. We are scheduled for this session in the beginning to talk about Working Group Review. Yrjö has asked us since we unfortunately skipped the GAC prep session in our last section that he asked for few minutes to talk about the GAC meeting we'll be having with the GAC. I think that's what he's going to talk about. Yrjö, it's all yours.

---

*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.*

---

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Thank you, Alan. I just asked for this two minutes to make everybody aware that we have a joint session with the GAC on Tuesday 14:00-15:00 in the GAC room. And I really hope that we have a good crowd from the ALAC to that meeting because now the cooperation between the GAC and ALAC start bearing some fruit, on the agenda we have of course the subsequent procedures, country territory names, community-based applications where some ideas are brought around about definitions, how to define a community, and what kind of types of communities they are.

Then this question of how to improve the information coming from ICANN to all the communities. There's a draft for a joint statement and of course our hope is that that could be approved at this meeting. Then GDPR likely and cooperation in capacity building in undeserved – underserved rather – underserved regions if there are any new developments there.

So please come to that meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's amazing how much difference one letter makes, from underserved to undeserved. Flips the meaning completely with one letter. We have someone who wants to add to a joke. We never stop you from adding jokes.

---

MATTHEW RANTANEN: Okay, so this is Matthew Rantanen from the U.S. from the tribal community and we actually received an award from the WCA, the Wireless Community for undeserved businesses, [inaudible] to our network. They had a typo on their trophy. I still have it on my desk.

ALAN GREENBERG: Matthew, honesty hurts.

MATTHEW RANTANEN: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: I could continue with that joke but I think maybe we should stop and go on to real work. All right. Give me a moment.

We have had discussions on cleaning up our working group list more times than I can remember. We never get to do it. It is now one of the items on our At-Large review list that we have to tick off so if I have anything to say, we will do it. It's often been proven I don't have anything to say in these matters but we're going to try.

The issue is at this point, if you go to our website and click on the button Get Involved, you will be presented with a long list. The

---

list is not necessarily accurate. Now I will point out that Evan has spent a lot of time over the last couple of weeks cleaning up the wiki sites and trying to make them somewhat uniform where it's appropriate and identifying working groups among others that – it's hard to ask people to get involved when they click on it and find the last meeting was in 2009. It's a little bit disheartening. It's also somewhat misleading to click on a list and it tells you, "Sorry you can only join this meeting if you have certain qualities." And in fact, nobody can join that group. It's a lie. Because the group is selected specifically for – the membership is prescribed.

So a lot of the cleanup will be done just because it's not accurate right now. On the other hand, we have some decisions to make, and we have presented to you and it was sent to you a while ago. So if you can't read it, you should have it on your own computer.

A little bit about some terminology values and if we can make that any larger, it would be nice. But if we can't, we can't. I have gone through it and put together what I call a straw person of what I think we may want to do with that. Nothing is cast in concrete at this point but we need to come out of this meeting for most of these groups deciding how we're going forward.

---

Now, we did make a decision a while ago. Or at least certainly it was a recommendation from Tijani that was strongly supported that for every working group we go through and make sure that our list of membership is current. So just because you joined it seven years ago and have not chosen to get off the mailing list, we would like a positive affirmation you are still interested in the group. So we'll be doing that with all working groups. It will be up to each working group to either just query the people who we know are not active or query everyone on the group. We'll talk about processes separately from that. But we will be going through and making sure that the mailing lists and the membership of the committees are moderately current.

There's a concept of archiving working groups. If we archive a working group, it will no longer show up on a list of Get Involved. The mailing list will be made inactive so we don't get spam on it. But everything else stays. So we don't lose the information. We don't lose the archives. If we ever want to go back and reactivate it or find the information, it's there.

We have at least one working group that will talk about where the working group is completely inactive. It's not clear there are members. But it's an important subject. I'm talking about IDN. And I'm proposing that we have a concept of subject matter experts. So for areas where it's important that we have someone who can respond or can talk about things. But they don't meet.

---

That will have a new category. It's not a working group but we don't lose the concept. I'm also suggesting we may want a concept of – and I don't know if we want to call it a working group or not where there's a mailing list. The group doesn't meet. But it's a place that we can bring up subjects. The Technical Issues Working Group is a current example of that. E-mail occasionally gets transferred. They haven't met in a good seven years. So I'm suggesting we formalize that.

And lastly, there are a set of categories of groups or set of groups that have membership that are appointed by RALOs or by the ALAC. And those have to be repopulated because at the end of this meeting, it'll be a new year. So we will be going through and doing that. That's not discretionary. We simply have to do that.

So I'd like to go through this list but first I see we have a number of people who have put up cards and I'm presuming this is to discuss the concepts we're talking about and not the specific working groups even if I happen to have mentioned one as an example now. And I have three people in our – four people in our queue.

We have allocated a little over an hour for this. And we of course have already gone way past the starting point. So we have a little under an hour left. So we're going to have to time

---

ourselves. And I'm not quite sure what the queue is but I'm going to pretend it is John. Who is next? Eduardo?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't really care.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, you see only to the left side. You never see to the right side.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do see to the right sometimes. And I ignore the left. If you recall for several years, I never called on Holly. Okay, we're going to go – no one's allowed to put up a card right now. We're going around the room in clockwise order regardless of the order your cards were up. We have Dave first.

DAVID FARRAR: Thanks. Just one observation then regarding the working groups that are out especially internal working groups that are not really meant for public – we want public At-Large community to actually join and get involved. We could probably move safely from the public facing website. I'm talking about those groups

---

that are appointed only by RALO Chairs and so forth. Because there's no real way for the public to really interact with it. So that's just one suggestion. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. If that list on the screen was scrolled all the way down to the bottom, you would see a new category of closed groups. We're not hiding them but they're not there for you to join. So thank you. John.

JOHN LAPRISE: Is there any meaningful distinction between working groups and ad hoc working groups in this list? Yeah, I was more concerned with just the ad hoc versus the regular working group. I don't know the rest of it. I assume that there's a distinction but I don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is maybe. On occasion, we have created something that we didn't want to call it a working group to live forever. So we have tended to use the term task force for things that are short-lived and particular focus.

May I finish? Okay. Working party was a brand new term that was coined by the GNSO Review. And since we had to follow the



---

GNSO in everything, we called ours a working party. ICANN has now since used that term in other places, so we'll probably see it proliferating. Subcommittees are actually subcommittees of the ALAC that are at times designated with responsibility by the ALACs, they are different. I'm not sure that answers it completely. Part of it is somewhat arbitrary. Part of it has history. It may be relevant to continue. It may be reasonable to ditch them altogether and start from scratch.

Next we have Eduardo.

[EDUARDO DIAZ]:

My recommendation is get rid of all these subcommittees that force the ad hoc and just make it only one category. And the only thing that I don't see there is I'm not sure when these working groups have been there since when? Since 2001? 2005? And the ad hoc if these are to be term limited, would you have a date when they disappear? Those are recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I would suggest we not focus on the names today. We do have some cleanup to do. But I don't want this to be a debate over which name do we pick and why. But point is taken.

Evan, we'll put you at the end of the queue. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I really like the concept of having only working groups that are involved in active policy development. If you've got people who have got expertise in a particular area, but they're not actually doing anything at the time, just call them experts and have a category for that that's not a working group. My concern is we're going to wind up with lots of titles and lots of Rules of Procedure for each group.

I'd rather have one name that works and I think we can have a thing called the Standing Committee such as Budget. Every year we're going to have people who have to look at finances. Every year we're going to have to look at a few things.

Then we have ad hoc ones. And I hate calling it a separate term, but ad hoc that relate to particular activities. And if you don't have those too, don't call it something else but have it something else. So that that list actually is short and reflects either items that are ongoing such as budget, such as technical, and we can tell that because they meet frequently, or ad hoc that's actually in response to a particular issue. When the issue's over, it just disbands.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. May we please not talk about names and onto substance. Next we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I made several proposals. One of them is about membership, meaning that the membership should be reviewed each year according to people who are participating or not and according to the will of the people if they want to continue or not. But I made also other proposals such as a charter for each working group and also the review of the leadership. Even if we want this leader in this working group, we have to confirm it each year. Otherwise, we will have a working group for X, and this is not good in my point of view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. You surprise me. It's very difficult to have people within a working group. But it is more difficult to have people working within the working group. Usually a lot of people involved, and very few do the work and so the goal is actually never met. As Holly said, I am not really a person who likes procedure. But there is a minimum that we need to have. It doesn't really matter what the name is of the working group but

---

that group has to have a leader. That leader needs to define the scope, schedule, and with these two things, it's just more than enough. And that leader should be in contact with the group members and to check whether – I mean that if they cannot work they should be removed from the group.

There are some people who are being proposed for certain positions and they demanded to be – the members of other groups such as the FCE. And I was once told I have two in one of my RALO and those two people hadn't really participated in any meeting of the group, and so they weren't able to have access to other working groups.

So I think the leader of the working group needs to be in charge of those issues. They need to say, "Well if you cannot work here, then you will be removed from the group." Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next we have Evan. Evan has yielded his position. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I think we need to define what membership is. For example, when you look at the wiki pages for each one of the working groups, we see that they are out of date. And taking, for example, the Technical Issues Working Group, no technical task

---

force to technical issues. I think it's got like six people listed but if you look at the actual mailing list, there are about 25 to 30 people on there including because we are an open part of ICANN including people who are not strictly speaking in the ALAC or the At-Large ALSes and so on, so we need to define our membership whether these groups are open to everyone, whether they're appointment only of members, and then observers, or whether there's a hierarchy in those.

I totally support what's been said – we then need to have the Chairs and any of the leaders of those groups to be accountable. And if they don't perform, out. And appoint new people. If we can't appoint new persons, then we really have a problem because I think that's where the work takes place, a working group. Not on the ALAC mailing list which I remind everyone is only ALAC members and regional leaders and everyone else can read but cannot post to it. Not on the At-Large mailing list because that would then be a potpourri of absolutely everything and be absolutely overwhelmed. So I really hope that we can work this one out. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I would suggest that the charter or mission that Tijani was talking about is the appropriate place to define what the class of membership is. We do have perhaps a mechanical

---

problem that we need to resolve of is there a difference between the membership list and the members of the mailing list. And that's something I think we need to resolve and it may be different for each one. So it's not something we're going to resolve today. But it's something that I think each group is going to have to discuss and we may want some uniform rules for ALAC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We had a standard format for those working group wiki pages and it seems to have gone out the window. So we need a standard format again as well to make it more pleasing to the eye and more easy for people to work out their mind.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe we now have something reasonably standard. If we don't like that standard, then we need to take some action on it.

Next we have Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think also we need to have some mechanism for appointing Chairs and changing it and having it. One group I'm in, the Chair was appointed or self-appointed. No one voted. And also sometimes no one e-mails the group that there's a meeting or

---

what the agenda is or anything. And I think that if a group cannot involve the members and tell people what it is, it just stops being a group. But some other issues is sometimes you're put in this list like the captioning project where we were like a small group but because we needed a mailing list, they put us on this group list. And I think groups could have a mailing list to work out issues but don't necessarily need to be on one of these meeting groups. I don't understand how the procedure of getting that type of thing. So it's two questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you are supporting the concept that I proposed of having a mailing list category where there's not a working group as such, but it is an active mailing list.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right. For issues on that thing for some issues and some parts that were also on the other idea of the Chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: I heard the first part. I was just clarifying the second part, that is you're just reaffirming that we have such a category.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Next we have Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I would like to suggest that we follow the example of what is done when it works into working group with the members and the observers who are the one who want to be on the mailing list but will not participate to the work, that it's clear. Even though I'm disappointed from the group I am a part of, we have 22 people supposedly members or participants and there are just five or six who really participate.

And the second suggestion I make is that maybe – and I know that you don't want we talk about names but I suggest that we create something like point of contact who may be not an expert or could be an expert but is the one when we will have a certain topic, we will come to him or her to see how we can organize the work if we have comments to be made or something about topics in charge of. This idea came yesterday when we met with the responsible for the consumer situation within staff. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Noted. I've run out of speakers unless I missed someone. Alberto wants a second time. We do have to



---

eventually get to this list. So Alberto and then we'll go on to the review of the actual list. Please go ahead quickly.

ALBERTO SOTO: What you said about the competencies. It was 2:00 a.m. in Argentina, a working group call, and as always I joined the AC, the Adobe Connect very happy and then say, "Hi, everyone, greetings." And Cheryl answers with a smile or something on the Adobe Chat and we were just four – actually, three people. Because Cheryl joined twice the AC. So I don't know. You said 12 or 14 is compliant but actually we were three.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not sure what meeting you're talking about.

ALBERTO SOTO: It was Working Group Subgroup of the WS2 on the Ombudsman. We are several people in that working group but on that specific call, we were just three people. So I said, "Hi all," and we were just three people.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's something Sebastian was talking about then. Okay, sorry. I'm not part of that group so it didn't ring a bell at all.

---

If I could ask us to go through the list. If we could put it back to the top of the list please. And I'd like staff to take notes as we go forward of any decisions we make. The Finance and Budget Subcommittee I believe is a group we still want. Now we've lost the last column. That one is repopulated every year. If I remember correctly... Someone will have to remind me, I don't remember. I think it's one ALAC member selected by three from each region and one person appointed by the RALO. And then we can have other people, we will call them observers for the moment, who may participate in the calls but are not the formal decision-making process.

So that one I would say stays. We need to repopulate because it's a new year. And we will review the overall membership as we have discussed prior to that. Are there any comments on that? Or anyone differ on that recommendation? Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I thought we were still on the larger question. And the larger question was, do we have working parties – I'm not going to use the name – do we have groups? So do we have categories of groups? And if so, do we have categories plus mailing list? I mean we're going through this list without having answered the question that you asked. So can we have an answer as to what the overall structure is? And I didn't hear a lot of discussion on

---

that but it would be nice to know, are we talking about actually thinking through what groups are ongoing and do we have a separate category for ongoing? Do we have a separate category for groups that were just ad hoc because they're addressing a particular issue? And then experts? What are we doing with this list other than can we solve what we're doing with it before we do it?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I believe as we're going to go through this list, we will identify if we don't need it anymore, or archive it, or it's one with a finite list – finite lifetime. The question of whether the mailing list is synonymous with the membership, I would tend to think they are, but we have to look at the mechanics of it and logistics. I don't want to add a huge workload to staff to synchronize them. I'm not quite sure to what extent we can automate it. I see no reason for differentiating between members and the members of the mailing list. If we choose to have observers, we may want to treat them in a slightly different way.

HOLLY RAICHE:

But my understanding is that we were going to ask if we have standing committees because the idea with the same issue every year or not. Or do we just have committees and say they have an ongoing life? Or they're continuing and we're just

---

knocking everything off. It seems to me I don't know what categories you want to put those in. That's my question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe in the vast majority of these, these are ongoing efforts if they still need an existence at all. There may be one or two which are finite in scope – and we'll talk about those as we go forward one by one. I don't really want to debate whether they are standing committee or committee or a working group.

We have a queue who wants to clearly have this debate now. Eduardo and Tijani.

[EDUARDO DIAZ]: I don't want to debate it. I just want to recommend that if we're going to this list, if you're going to have a line item saying what's the purpose of the committee because not everybody knows what their purpose are.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Tijani made the point and we've made this point a number of times before that if we can't at the very least a mission or an objective of a committee, then it shouldn't exist. So let us presume that if we say there's a valid reason, if that paragraph is not written and many of them, they are written

---

already, if they are not written, they will have to be written. If we really can't figure out three sentences to describe what it does, then maybe we have to go back and rethink this decision. If we're going to start drafting missions in this group, we are not going to get past the first three lines.

Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. No, we will not do it now for sure. But I wanted just to say that how we can go forward now. In my point of view, we have to go one by one and for each one, we can say this is a standing group. Or this is a subcommittee etc. Do it one by one. Otherwise, if we will start now to define the kind of groups etc., we will not finish. So let's go one by one.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That is what I was trying to do and on line one, I was interrupted and said we have to go back and define the kind of group. So I support you, Tijani, in this particular case.

Ricardo and Olivier. Ricardo and then Olivier.

---

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Just to understand, you're going to say what is in each one and you're going to populate it now? At least we will have to decide when we're going to repopulate it or how.

ALAN GREENBERG: The word repopulate means that the membership is established at the beginning of every ICANN year. And this is the beginning of an ICANN year so at the end of this meeting, we will have to set the new members. They will either be selected by ALAC members or they are selected because they are ALT members or they will be appointed by their RALO, depending on the rules for each group. So it will have to be done once the new year starts. The new year doesn't start until Saturday. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I'm quite startled by the questions that are being asked here, the first one being "Could we have a description of each one of those groups?"

Bartlett Morgan, incoming ALAC, has one step ahead of you already put in the chat the link to the working group's wiki, and if you click on each one of the working groups, you will see the full description of what each one of them does. So if we can then go through this, and you've all got Adobe Connect, and I'll look

---

at the different things, then we don't need to go through the description of each one of them.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are not going to go through the description in this meeting other than –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We are not doing description. We're going to read through these. People can read the description and discuss.

ALAN GREENBERG: If they choose to. We have simply committed that we will have the description if we think we need to keep the working group. If there is not one there, we will fix it. Then if they're all there and they're all perfect, we don't have to debate it.

We now have 25 minutes to finish this. Financing Subcommittee, do we have agreement that it will stay? We will repopulate, we will check membership.

PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement. We still need it. We will repopulate the RALO appointed people. I don't think there are ALAC appointed people on that one. But if there are, we will fix that and we will verify the membership. Agreed?

PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: One very small thing. It's also useful if there is not ALAC member participating – former ALAC member participating because we need engagement up to the top. Sorry for the top. And that will be useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I suggest, if the Outreach and Engagement currently does not have a rule requiring an ALAC member, then the Outreach and Engagement and/or the ALAC may well want to reconsider that. I don't remember what the current rule is. We have Dev and Maureen.



---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. So just one announcement is that I'll be stepping down as the Outreach and Engagement Chair at the end of this meeting. So that's one.

And the second thing, there's no restriction as such. It's open to everyone. But the fact that it's an ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement it was an expectation certainly that there would be ALAC members on the subcommittee. But in practice it has not happened.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection however is that there are RALO appointed people on that committee. I believe. If we need to rethink the rules, then we will on a one-by-one basis.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to clarify, when the group was reconstituted, the call went out to the RALO list up to repopulate the group when the ALAC changed it from Outreach to Outreach and Engagement in two years ago.

ALAN GREENBERG: Three. Maureen.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to mention that if there were RALO appointments to the co-Chair positions, it just happened to be that I was an ALAC member as well. And that's why we never really sort of looked too much into having an ALAC representative. But if it's the way that it will go, that's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can certainly come back and talk about how these groups need to be constituted if indeed it's not already clear. And I'd like to do that as a second pass if we can.

Next group is Subcommittee on Metrics. It needs to be reactivated or we can essentially dissolve this committee and put it in as a task of the At-Large Review to create metrics. So we have committed this part of the At-Large Review to do that. And again, that's a debate that we need to have whether we need an ongoing Metrics Committee or simply get it done and dissolve. I don't really care which it is and I'm not sure we need to debate it today. Clearly, we need to do some work on metrics.

Tijani, I see your hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Why is it a subcommittee? I don't think it should be a subcommittee. This is a group that will do the work and then we

---

will not have metrics to put every day. So it is more or less ad hoc than a subcommittee.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since we're not assigning names today, we will put that on a reminder list that we probably want to change that name. Thank you. I agree with your analysis. I'm just trying to encourage that we not talk about each of the names as we go through and decide whether the group is needed or not.

Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Now what Tijani has said is interesting because if I understand correctly, Tijani, you believe that the group will create a set of metrics. And then implementation and so on will be left to someone else, to staff to – how would that work? Because my feeling was it would do the metrics and then continue the analysis of metrics as time goes on. So this task once the metrics are done and the tracking of ALSes and participation etc. would be performed jointly by staff and a group. Wouldn't it?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: In my point of view, it is not the work of the group. The group will set the criteria and then the implementation means the collection of data, the treatment of those data, will be done by the staff, I think. I don't think that volunteers will have time to do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: On the other hand, if there is merit that volunteers should be part of that process, then that may be a reason for having a Metrics Subcommittee. That's not what this one is doing.

Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I just have an issue with the setting of the criteria and I think that this is where the Metrics Group fell down a bit because it was actually given a role of establishing criteria of things that were sort of being organized elsewhere. And I think that what happens is that criteria should be set. The Metrics Group works on the metrics that are required for the criteria. So this is where – like I mean my viewpoint anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, I think that's mission and what it is doing. At this point, it is quite clear we have work to do on creating, designing metrics

---

that we can use to track performance whether it should be a group or relegated as one of the subtasks of the At-Large Review Implementation. I think we can decide when we start looking at that aspect.

John?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah. I recommend that we table this particular one until we're further down the road and we'll be on the review. Because until we get some hard data from there, we won't know what metrics they want. So let's just table this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Sebastien and Daniel.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I just agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Daniel and Olivier again. We're now down to 20 minutes.

DANIEL HALLORAN: I agree that the Metrics Group is really relevant. But we have to check on how frequently are they going to be engaged in their

---

respective actions. Probably I would suggest that it should be shifted from the subcommittee such that it becomes a working group that is recalled whenever there is need. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And I'm disagreeing with my colleagues regarding the Metrics Working Group because we have an At-Large summit coming up and we need to have enough time to collect data about our At-Large Structures, bearing in mind we will probably have a maximum of 250 spaces and there might be more than 300 ALSes and probably more individual members. So a lot of people will not be going to the At-Large Summit.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no question we are going to have to start collecting data really quickly for that. We've already decided that whether that is the Metrics Group or three people getting together and coming up with something that is viable and proposing it to the ALAC remains to be seen.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And I don't think that it is the work of the Metrics Group.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: 17 minutes left and Daniel.

[DANIEL NANGHAKA]: I think it's a collaborative effort between the Metrics Group and the staff. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. May we go on to the next item? ALAC Subcommittee on – sorry. I'm just having a problem with this because we called it the ALAC Appointee Selection Committee and then somewhere along the way they became the "Subcommittee on," and I have trouble phrasing this. And I will note that we have always had a Subcommittee on Finance and Budget, which we called the FBFC. Perhaps we will end up with uniform names by the time we finish. But we're not talking names today.

Okay, the Appointee Subcommittee we invented slightly over a year ago. It has been very successful. I am presuming we will keep it. It will have to be repopulated because of the way in which it exists. And is there any more further debate on this one? Thank you. We are finished this section which is no longer a section.

---

The next group is the At-Large Registration Issues Working Group. This is a group which existed at one point, looked at things related to among other things WHOIS, but not restricted to it. We have been saying we need to resuscitate it, reactivate it, reconstitute it, and several other res. For the last at least two years, we have not succeeded. I believe we are still in that category. And unless we want to change the name, to arbitrarily change the name, I think we need to figure out how to make it work. We are not going to do that in this meeting. But is there anyone who believes we do not need such a group under this name or a slightly different name?

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And we're not discussing the names so I shan't comment on that. But I do believe that this group is super important. WHOIS registration directory services, GDPR, all of these things are coming to a head. The next few months should see activity in that. If it doesn't, then I don't know why we're here. Thank you.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: I would ask the question and any future speakers might want to think about it, why are we having such a hard time finding anyone who says they want to work on it? Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's a good question, President. But I would like to suggest that there is a further down gTLD directory services. That at least we merge the two because it's the same issue and put also the GDPR [inside] this group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for my edification, where do you see registration services later on? Okay, you're telling me this is their way down. Okay. I can't hear you if you don't turn your microphone on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Two up from Ad Hoc Working Group, this one in red. That one died years ago. And it was merged into the registry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That is the Expert gTLD Registration Services. That was a group that was chartered to either follow or work after the Expert Working Group convened on directory services. That one is not applicable. The word expert puts it in a different category.

---

So I don't think we need to worry about it. But we will get to that one in a moment.

Okay, I hear no disagreement that we need to keep the current top group in the second category. We do need to figure out how to find someone who's willing to share it and we need to figure out how to repopulate it. I am at a loss for knowing why we cannot but we have had no volunteers. We do have distributed the same time this chart was distributed was a prototype mission for this group which we'll get to if we have time today. But if not, I think we're going to have to put the small working group – forgive the expression – to figure out how to make this alive again.

Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Don't we have people who participate in the GNSO process about DS, WHOIS, and so on? Then we need to find one of them taking care of this working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, and I know who they are. And I don't think any of them are going to volunteer. I'm one of them. But yes, they are the core people in the group to act as the experts. But I don't think they can be necessarily the ones to lead it.

---

Technical Issues Working Group. I believe this is active. I'm sorry, Technical Issues Working Group is one that has met very, very rarely seems to be relevant and I would suggest we relegate this to a mailing list and not call it an active working group. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Alan. It is important at the moment due to the root zone key signing key rollover which as you will have noticed has been delayed. We have about 25 members on this thing including people who are not from our community, including senior technical ICANN staff. So it's a very good link. And it also is a link to the ccNSO tech people as well because we have some ccNSO tech people on this. There is some flurry of traffic from time to time but the KSK has generated some very interesting discussions.

That's it, thanks. Keeping it to a mailing list is probably fine and if it needs to do any calls, which is probably unlikely, then we can always ask for a slot. That's it, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Always do that. Yes, the person keeping that mailing list alive is [inaudible] renouncing Tech Day for every ICANN meeting. So you're agreeing, mailing list is the current resolution of this one right now. Seun, please go ahead.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sorry. May I suggest that those who disagree with what you propose, are you only putting that actually speak so we can make progress?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Seun. Next one – by the way we have 10 minutes left. Next one is the IDN Policy Working Group. And I’m suggesting that one become a subject matter expert and not a working group. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I think we’ve reached – we’ve passed the question of whether there should be IDNs or no IDNs so policy has pretty much been put to the side. Most of the questions regarding IDNs today are technical. And therefore I would suggest that perhaps this would be folded into the Technical Issues Working Group because most of the work is about Label Generation Rules, which are very highly technical as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev. We have Tijania and Hadia. I will point out in the past when this was being discussed, it has been pointed out that on

---

occasion, there are specific IDN issues and really wanted to keep an IDN specialist as opposed to simply saying it's a technical issue. But I will defer to Tijani and Hadia.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Olivier it's not only technical. It's technical and language. So I think we don't have any advantage to merge it inside the Technical Group.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll go to Olivier next. I will point out the next subject is talking about travel policy. We could of course defer that and say – I'm sorry, Hadia next and then Olivier – we could of course cancel discussion on future travel policy if you'd like. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I don't know what you've been discussing before in the IDN Policy Working Group. However, I don't find the IDN issues only technical issues. I think that at this point actually, we have a lot of issues related to engagement and awareness. And this is a very important topic for IDNs. And I think that this is what's hindering actually the takeoff of the IDNs in my region at least. It's not the technical issues, but it's the engagement and awareness of the people. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you suggesting we want an active working group which is going to meet on a regular basis? I don't think you're suggesting that. Tijani, you're saying no, no, no. I don't know what – who is Tijani agreeing with?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with you, Alan. It should be expert.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'm just trying to determine if someone's disagreeing with me because I think we are ready – Seun suggested we only talk about people who are disagreeing. Dev is disagreeing.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to say that I don't think it makes a semantic difference between subject matter and having a mailing list. You may as well just have the mailing list of the people who care about IDNs. And when it is issued then part it over to the mailing list and have the discussion there. And if they want to talk about IDNs, great.

ALAN GREENBERG: I suggest if we have more than two subject matter experts, will they become a mailing list.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So I've been convinced by my colleagues. And so it is not only technical. It also is universal acceptance and other issues and linguist issues and so on. May I ask for two things? The first one that we have a different staff support for this group because I believe Ariel Liang is leaving us. So she is supporting several groups, and it would be important to make sure we got this transferred.

The second one for staff to send anything that's related to IDNs when it comes down to public comments to that mailing list because they haven't been doing that, unfortunately. And that's valid for the other working groups as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we have agreement on what is suggested there. I think, I'm not sure. And we have five minutes to do the next 20.

Capacity Building Working Group. It is working well. We need to verify the membership. We will of course always look at leadership and make sure we have a mission. Done? Done. Thank you.

New gTLDs Working Group. It's in the same category as the registration issue. It's super critical. We have had a great deal of

---

trouble populating it. I don't think we can say it's not important. Olivier is saying it's not important.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I think it just needs a Chair. And there is one thing. Avery was one of the Chairs and she's now in the Board. So if you want to go on the Board at some point in your life, you might wish to chair that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. I'm trying to figure out where we are next. I don't know what you're pointing out. No, he put his card down.

Public Interest Working Group. At this point, do we believe it still has a reason for existing? And if so, do we need to do anything? Currently, the Chair is not here. He has been ill. He may choose to continue. He may choose to resign. We do have a Vice-Chair who is active. And Olivier wishes to say something.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I believe Satish Babu is the Vice-Chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just said that. We do have a Vice-Chair.



---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I didn't hear Satish Babu. I thought you said, "Do we have a Vice-Chair?"

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I didn't mention his name. I did say we do have one. And we have a speaker queue of Tijani and Heidi.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Do you know where we are going in this working group? Because I am really upset. I have my mind in this issue but I don't see that there is traction for it. So I don't see where we are going in this working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest we need to look at it in some depth which is not this meeting. It was originally created when there was supposed to be a Cross-Community Working Group and this was one of the shadow groups that was going to feed into it. That never came into existence. It has not been a very active working group except for interesting meetings at ICANN meetings. Other than that, it is essentially dead in between the meetings. No it is not dead in between the meetings. It is very active in between the meetings. Okay. Yes, go ahead.

---

HEIDI ULRICH: I'm the staff lead for that working group and they do meet regularly at ICANN meetings. They also meet about once or twice between. There is going to be a meeting this Thursday which Satish is chairing and the agenda basically will look at next steps as well in particular about moving the possibility of moving that At-Large Public Interest Working Group to a Cross Community Committee. That would move it out of At-Large into something like the Academy or the Accessibility Working Group Cross-Community Committee.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think that means for the moment we leave it and it may evolve as the time goes forward.

Next item is the Social Media Working Group. It is active. I would suggest that we keep it as such. And that we verify the membership as we will for all groups. No disagreement.

Meeting Strategy Working Group. That was a group that existed –

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. If the Chair of the Social Media Working Group is John Laprise, I'm standing down as Chair of the Social Media Working

---

Group. And of course Leon Sanchez, who's now going under the ICANN Board.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We don't need to discuss Chairs at this point, but noted. Meeting Strategy Working Group is essentially a defunct group which stayed on the list. I would suggest we have to archive that one and not worry about it at this point.

Next one, Expert gTLD Working Group. As already discussed, that was something associated with the Expert Working Group on Directory Services. It is no longer applicable.

Workspace for ccNSO Study Group on the Names of Countries and Territories. That was a working group that shadowed a now dead group. And I presume we can put this one out of its misery and archive it.

We're making progress. Maybe we should see how fast we can go. At-Large Community Regional Outreach Program Review Team, CROP. I would suggest that we have said several times, we need to discuss whether that group should continue to exist, and if so what its mission is and make sure that we all agree going forward. That is not a discussion we can have in the next minute or two. So I think we will schedule perhaps a special purpose call for this and try to come to closure on that one. And

---

hopefully if we all agree on something, we'll then remember we agreed. Go forward.

At-Large Review Working Group Working Party. I think that one we need to discuss again in a larger – whether we use the existing working party, reformulate it, repopulate it or whatever. Again, it's – clearly we can't not have a group under some name but it's a larger discussion that we can't have right now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Somebody's going to be congratulated for this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: At least they're not hammering on the roof. Where are we, sorry. ICANN Evolution Working Group. That is the former IANA Ad Hoc Group. It still serves a purpose. It may well dissolve once the CCWG Accountability Works finishes. I think at this point it stands.

Captioning Pilot Project. Is that still applicable as a group within our community?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It should be a mailing list because we do have some issues we're discussing but it doesn't need to be a group. We can just have a mailing list.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Everyone agree? Mailing list it is. And we're making progress.

Board Candidate Evaluation Committee. That is a group which has to be archived. We will presumably have another one sometime in the future. But this one is now effectively done. Similar with the BMSPC. There are still some Rules of Procedure changes that may need to be made because of this but the group itself will probably not be meeting again. So I think we can safely archive that.

The Ad Hoc New Meeting Strategy Working Group. Same category.

The Ad Hoc Website Revamp Task Force. We may need to revamp our website again one day. And perhaps it needs changes today but that group I think is long gone.

The Ad Hoc Joint At-Large and NCSG Working Group on NTA Topic Coordination Workspace, if it ever really existed other than in the name being created, I think it's gone now.

Task Forces. ALS Criteria and Expectation Task Force will be moved effectively into the At-Large review work. Olivier, you have a comment.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much , Alan. I was going to suggest merging it with the Metrics Working Group because I've never understood why there were these two separate working groups doing the same thing, except if I kind of misunderstand what the metrics are perhaps too.

ALAN GREENBERG: The criteria also was not metrics, it was establishing the rules. But I think we are out of time at this point. So we've made some progress. I hope staff has captured what we are doing.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think on that one, also they want to put it maybe not as metrics but as a subcategory to something else. To metrics as subcategory to At-Large review because maybe people who are just interested in working on definition or issues and other type of issues surrounding that and not necessarily on metrics-related issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry to cut you off. We really need to go to our guests who are here, and it is a larger discussion we're going to have in the next few minutes. I'm not quite sure when we'll finish this list

---

but it's not likely to be this week. But we'll try to do it at some point in the very near future.

Thank you all for the progress we've made. And now we have – sorry. Carlos Reyes and Patrick Jones for the record. Now they are here to talk about something called Community Resource Consultation which at the moment I think relates mainly to travel issues. Although it will grow into other things as time moves forward if I understood correctly. And I'll turn it over.

PATRICK JONES:

Thank you once again for having time for Carlos and I to come and talk to At-Large. We shared the documents that hopefully has gone out to your list, provide some background on the ICANN community travel guidelines and why we're trying to take a more proactive and wider look at the overall issue of the resources that are provided to the ICANN community.

We're hoping to collect a wide range of views on the questions that were in the document from all of the impacted Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, stakeholder groups and constituencies. And with that, we don't have a formal presentation inasmuch as that we hope that some of you have had a chance to look at those questions to think about how that impacts your either At-Large Structures or the RALOs or your organizations. And just to let you know that we are available and

---

we are looking for a wide range of views. Carlos, if you want to add anything to that.

CARLOS REYES:

Thanks, Patrick. So as Patrick mentioned, we've circulated this questionnaire, this initial questionnaire to all the leaders of the SO/AC groups as well as stakeholder groups, constituencies, and the GNSO and the RALOs of the At-Large community. So the intent is to really gather as much feedback as possible on the effectiveness or areas for improvement with the guidelines. But if there are examples of what is working well, we also want to hear the whole breadth of any feedback you have about the guidelines for how the ICANN Organization allocates travel support to the community.

As Patrick mentioned at the onset, we're really approaching this a little more comprehensively per guidance from the Board that this is not only to focus on travel support, that's where we're starting. But this is a broader conversation that the Board has asked us to begin with the community on different resources that we allocate in support of the community and your work. So again, no formal presentation. If you have any initial feedback, we definitely welcome that now but we really hope you take a look at the questionnaire and provide any feedback or input for



---

us to consider as we begin the process of revising the guidelines and with that, I'll –

So our anticipated timeline is that we are hoping to receive responses to the questionnaire by the 17<sup>th</sup> of November. We will then take all of the inputs that have been received and we've started a wiki page that right now accessible to the community. So we're going to collect and post the responses to the questionnaire there. We'll do a summary and analysis of comments.

Those inputs that relate to the ICANN community travel guidelines, we'll feed in to kickoff the public comment process on the revision of the guidelines. Those guidelines were last updated in 2013. So that was before the Cross-Community Working Groups really came into use. It was before any of the current ICANN Bylaws, reviews were implemented. In a sense, in many cases, they're out of date for the way that the community is using the travel guidelines.

Then for those areas that are highlighted in the consultation that are outside the scope of the travel guidelines themselves, I think we'll want to present those back to the community and the Board and sort of ask where is the appropriate place for these other issues that might be highlighted to be dealt with.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a speaker queue of Olivier and Humberto and me. Olivier? Olivier is waiving his turn for the moment. Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you. I will speak in Spanish. Indeed, I have received a personal e-mail as the LACRALO leader. It's a ten-question questionnaire. I wanted to check if we are allowed to disclose it within our community or is it only for the leaders? In practical terms, can we distribute among our members? Thank you.

CARLOS REYES: Yes, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier. That was an old hand. Sorry. Okay. Before your phone rang, your card was up. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to be sure, can we have this link of the documents somewhere not in 10 days ago in our mailing list where it's not visible at least for me to find it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It will be resent. Staff, noted? Do I have confirmation that we have an action item that it will be resent? I haven't seen a yes

---

but I'm assuming there's a yes. I'm not asking you to resend it. We have to make sure. A link in the chat disappears by the time this meeting ends. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. I just want – a set of questions. And it seems to me like this is not what ALS would answer. It seems to me that this is what ALAC would respond to. So I think yes, we can – part of our process could lead to consult with ALSes but I don't think that's direct respondent. I think we should just let ALAC decide on how we want to get the feedback. And what I would suggest is that initially we ask staff to provide responses to each of them in terms of what we have at the moment. And we review it, we send the feedback back. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would suggest that any traveler may choose to answer themselves and not necessarily have a single ALAC. No? I think some of them do apply. It's not the case? Not the case. We'll take a further look at it.

Holly. Old hand. Any new hands? Then I'll exercise my hand which was up.

I'm going to say something that sounds completely obvious. I would like to have some level of confidence that whatever gets

---

put in the new guidelines actually gets followed and not randomly as staff decides. And for instance, the travel guidelines that were last set in 2013 or 2014, say this is for ICANN meetings. But they have been used for Review Teams since 2007, I think, or 2010. But they were never referenced. We say we're using them but we never changed the words which made it rather confusing what rules apply to non-ICANN meetings and what rules did not apply.

So again, whatever document you come out with, can we please be sure that we can actually rely on it as the policy and not something that will be adapted and interpreted differently by staff as they wish going forward.

I'm presuming that's a yes. I know you can't control how people use it once it's out of your hands. But it would be sort of nice. Anyone else have any comments at this point? Then we'll go back to our working group discussion I guess.

Sebastien, sorry I didn't see that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I have two comments. The first one is that I hope that at the end of this journey, we will not complexify the way we can participate travel in this process in participating to meetings because it's starting to be quite already complicated. You have

---

to say you are, for example, a member of one CCWG group. And then it's meeting one day and then you have to say that it's one day more but it's not the same place where you say that to the other. Then it's one point.

The second is that I suggest that you – I just read one question about stipend and per diem. I suggest that you put if you are having stipend, do you prefer to have. Because, for example, we get per diem then it's not a relevant question for us. And you have to add that for different groups where the current policy is diverse. NomCom get reimbursement, both get reimbursement but ALAC and other At-Large get per diem. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone else? Last call. Thank you. We have 10 more minutes left in this session. We'll go back to the working group list.

Remember where we were? Technology Task Force I think. Continued at least two implementation task force is archived and we will be creating a new group. Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. All right. These are Cross-Community Working Groups. These are to some extent out of our – some of them are out of our control. Obviously the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance is not an ALAC group. The exact status apparently will probably change.

---

Whatever it is, it will change and it's not under our control at this point. Correct?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So the GNSO Council has indicated its wish to withdraw from the Cross-Community Working Group by ICANN 61. In the meantime, what it has asked is for the working group to put together a different type of vehicle for its work. It believes that the work is important. And so the working group has come up with a replacement charter for a Cross-Community Engagement Group, CCEG. Why not?

And that will basically do exactly the same thing as the Cross-Community Working Group, but it will not have the working group part of it and it will be called an engagement group thus not being subjected to the actual rules as a Cross-Community Working Group as defined by the GNSO Council. So as a result, we should see some movement in that direction by ICANN 61. And I will let you know accordingly.

In the forthcoming meeting with the ccNSO, we shall be – I think there's a section where they will be asking some questions and I'm actually happy to answer questions at that point if required to do so. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I will note the ALAC was rather prescient when we approved the last charter change. And we said we approve the charter regardless of how the name may change or the group may be constituted. So we're covered.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I could just ask one more thing. One more thing, in your mailbox there should be a report of that working group for this series of activities. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Thank you. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: My question is for the next one.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Cross-Community Committee on Accessibility. This one has been sort of done under the auspices of ALAC although it hasn't – in theory we're saying it's a Cross-Community Group. To the extent it is ALAC. We will ensure its membership is correct to the extent it's not ALAC, it's not our business. And I think we need to clarify if there is a home or not a home somewhere else.

Heidi, do you have anything to add on this?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl certainly does.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl's invisible.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very rarely is that something I've been accused of. However, Heidi was trying to get your attention to say I had something to say. It is not ours. It has not been ours for some time. It doesn't belong there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then poof, it's gone. ICANN Academy Cross-Community Committee. I believe that is an identical situation. Poof, it's gone from our list.

ALAC ccNSO Coordination Working Group. I turn to our ccNSO liaison and does that really exist and if so, does it do anything and do we need it? She's looking at it and saying, "What?" I think that answers the question. It was created at one point. We go to the wiki and find out who created it. It might have been you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, if I may.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl knows something about it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. It may very well be that you need to check that what that membership list is is not merely the mailing list that coordinates our meeting preparation for meetings between the ccNSO and the ALAC. That is what's resonating with me.

ALAN GREENBERG: It just probably reverts to the category of a mailing list. And I hope someone is noting that.

The next item is do we want to list on our list of available places to work the Cross-Community Working Groups that may exist at any given time? And I would suggest that we may well want to advertise those within our list. We have a speaker list at this point. We have Sebastien, and we have Ricardo.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. And yes, I think it will be useful to list them to show to the people who come directly to At-Large and ALAC website to be able to join any of those groups. But I would like us to think about how we – are we not mirror those Cross-Community Working Groups with one Internet group? Is it

---

member designated by ALAC who are participating the one working group who is this small group within ICANN? Or is it another structure? For example, for the CWG and IANA Stewardship Transition and CCWG on Accountability, we had one group who mirrors two. That's my first point.

And my second, do we need also to have something to mirror the Review Teams? I would suggest that one way or another it will be important that we decide if it's at a level of one group or it's at the level of ALAC itself. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think that's an interesting discussion. Clearly we want communication. If you look at what's happened with the CCT Review Team, we've been getting regular reports. I don't think there's been a great desire to have a working group meeting on a regular basis at least no one has expressed that. But we do need to ensure communication and I think that's a discussion worthy of having in a more general case for Review Teams and other groups like that. We do not, for instance, have a shadow team for the CCWG auction proceeds. Should we? I'm not sure.

So I think those are really good subjects. But I think we have agreement that somehow, people visiting At-Large hear about the other groups exactly how we have a link and not replicate

---

things that get out of date. I think that may be a challenge for staff to look at and see how we can do that.

The next question was, do we also want to similarly advertise the ongoing PDPs or other working groups for which our people are welcome as members? Sorry, I missed Ricardo. I'll go back in a moment. And I would think that we similarly want to make sure that information about those is available through our participation page. Does anyone disagree? I'm not quite sure of the format. But I don't see any disagreement. You disagree? Okay. All right. We have Ricardo and then John.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I more or less agree with you that, for example, At-Large Community Working Group on Work Stream 2 is not there listed unless there is a lot of people from ALAC and At-Large in these working groups. And, for example, for someone that's not in ALAC, would you know who is exactly working, actively working or designated? Yeah, I understand there is a page for the group but it's not a link from ALAC to this group as you mentioned. It should be a link at least.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. John?

---

JOHN LAPRISE: Well, in general I'm supportive of giving opportunities to people who come to us to go find other sites. At least in the short term since we're still in the process of staffing up the working groups that we ourselves are running, I'd prefer to channel people into our own working groups. First get them staffed up and then offer the opportunity. So maybe it's a phase thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. We're just about out of time. We are meeting back here in this room in 15 minutes with the ccNSO. Please be on time. We will try to start on time. But you have a couple of minutes off at this point if you choose to leave.

We will need some room around the table for ccNSO people. So I'll let people self-select to what extent they want to be at the table or not. But we do have to allow at least some spots around the table for them.

Thank you. We are finished with this session. We reconvene in 15 minutes.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**