

CHAIR: So good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the At-Large and Meeting Strategy Working Group Meeting on Friday the 9th of August 2013. The time is 14:03 UTC and I think what we're going to have to do here is a quick roll call to find out who is on the call, because effectively this is a call with the ALAC with our participants that are on the Meeting Strategy Working Group. And then before we ask questions and so on I wanted to find out who was on and who was not.

So if I could ask Julia to please do the roll call, if that's okay with you?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: That is fine with me.

CHAIR: So good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the At-Large and Meeting Strategy Working Group Meeting on Friday the 9th of August 2013. The time is 14:03 UTC and I think what we're going to have to do here is a quick roll call to find out who is on the call, because effectively this is a call with the ALAC with our participants that are on the Meeting Strategy Working Group. And then before we ask questions and so on I wanted to find out who was on and who was not.

So if I could ask Julia to please do the roll call, if that's okay with you?

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.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: That is fine with me. I will start the roll call. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the At-Large and Meeting Strategy Working Group call on Friday 9th of August 2013 at 14 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Sebastien Bachollet, Ron Sherwood, Marueen Hilyard, Sylvia Herlein Leite, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Natalia Enciso, Winthrop Yu, Yaovi Atohoun, Eduardo Diaz, Leon Sanchez, Kerry Brown and Alberto Soto.

We have apologies from Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Sandra Joferichter who is a tentative apology, Holly Raiche, Ali AlMeshal and Dev Anand Teelucksingh. And from Staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Nathalie Peregrine and myself, Julie Charvolen.

May I please remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Julia. My name Olivier and so the first thing I was going to give you a little sort of feedback and introduction on what we're going to be doing here. The primary purpose of this meeting is to find a consolidated ALAC, and I mean ALAC as in the At-Large Advisory Committee Members themselves, consolidated ALAC point of view with regards to the meeting strategy that ICANN is currently looking at.

There's several different solutions which are going to be provided very soon in the update section of this Agenda but effectively I have found

through speaking to the various members of the Working Group that are coming from the At-Large community that we might not have exactly the same point of view as to what is a good idea and what is a less good idea. And in order for us not to end up contradicting each other in the Meeting Strategy Working Group meetings and in order for the At-Large participants of the Meeting Strategy Working Group to get a good feeling of what our own community is feeling with regards to the future meeting strategy.

I thought it would be a good idea for us all to discuss this and have a single purpose call on it. That's the basic idea behind it. We've got the members of the Meeting Strategy Working Group online. We've got Sebastien Bachollet who actually is, I believe, is chairing that group but we've also got with us, let's see Tijani is here, Sandra is not but she might be joining us a bit later. Satish Babu, do we have an apology or is he here? I can't see at the same time. I'm not sure whether we have Satish with us but we definitely have, as I said, Tijani and we have Eduardo, of course, and we also have Silvia who is on the phone on the Spanish channel I believe.

So effectively you've got three out of five of our people on this call and I guess the first thing that I should really ask is to get an update really for all of us to know what has been happening in the Meeting Strategy Working Group. What has been discussed so far?

Just to let you know, all of you, I have been invited to speak to the Working Group and to provide some of my own points of view with regards to how At-Large makes use of our meeting time.

I've provided a full diagram with full details of when we have our face to face meetings, when our RALO's have our face to face meetings, when our Working Groups have our face to face meetings and provided some kind of idea of how busy our meetings are.

Certainly one of the thoughts was to be able to rearrange, not only rearrange the overall calendar of meetings so touching on the three meetings per year strategy and maybe changing it to something else but the Meeting Strategy Working Group also looked at maybe rearranging the way the week went so you'd have a lot more cross community interaction than what we have at the moment. And showing the calendar of what we were doing, it was a particularly busy, it is a particularly busy time for the ALAC, for the regional leadership, for all of our participants who are at those meetings.

So I'm not quite sure now where the Meeting Strategy Working Group went from there and I therefore ask on any of the members of the Meeting Strategy Working Group who are with us at the moment to be able to give us a little bit of a feedback and perhaps a state of affairs as it is going today. I know the work is not finished and there's still a lot more work coming up but what have you been discussing so far? What have the different points of view been? And where are you going next?

The floor is now open so Sebastien, Satish, Tijani, Sandra, Silvia, Eduardo - any of you can start.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I think Sebastien can give the first update.

CHAIR: Thank you Tijani so let's start with Sebastien if he is hearing us. I see Eduardo has put his hand up so Eduardo you'll be able to go right after Sebastien. Let's start with Sebastien first quickly.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay thank you very much. Thank you for this meeting and the invitation to participate. We are not yet done as you say Olivier and we are going to some different, I would say, track to discuss different issues and of course the issue of the number of meetings per year. There is also the question of the rotation of the meeting within the region. And there is the question of the organization of the week, of the day of the meeting, the number of days, how it's organized.

I will say that we spend more time on the discussion about the number of meetings per year but the same time, you were the first one Olivier to be interviewed by the Working Group and now we got the feedback from the CCNSO from the ISO, NRO, and from gNSO. GNSO is a little bit more complicated than that. Some part of stakeholder group leaders and their constituency came to the call. It was done yesterday. I guess we have still a few questions to discuss with them but it's where we are. We still need to have at least a discussion with GAC. Hopefully we will do that first call in September.

Our timing is the following: we are committed with the help of staff to have a first draft document ready by the 10th of September. We will discuss it within the Working Group on the call the 2nd and the 3rd of September and I will, with the help of Sally Costerton who is leading this

effort from the staff side, give a report to the Board. The body who create our Working Group and maybe ask some advice about where to go and how to go the next phase.

The goal of the document will be to be open to have community feedback and I think it will be the good moment to have position paper or document agree among all At-Large at that time.

I just wanted to raise one point. It's not to say that this call is not useful but just bear in mind that what sometime at least from my point of view at least it is more important to have the original input and at last don't need yet to be agree on something.

The fact that there could be some disagreement between one region representative to another region representative it's not a big deal today. We are still in the phase of consolidating the arguments, the ideas. It will be in the next phase that if we can have a single point of view from At-Large it would be great and from ALAC of course.

I know that people within the Working Group are keen to have a document paper, it will be done in September. I guess the way we change, we create three subgroups and thank you for the leadership of Eduardo in one of them. And during the Durban meeting we didn't really do writing work or discussion on something in writing but we do more exchanges and new way of interacting or new way for our Working Group with subgroups and discussion with the community who are participating to the meeting on the survey.

I will stop here. I don't want to take too much time and once again the input from all the members of At-Large from the fifth region are

very good and very useful and I am sure that they have something to add to my introduction. I saw that, I guess Sally Costerton is with us and of course with your agreement Olivier, if she wants to speak, she will be welcome. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Sebastien for this snapshot about the current state of affairs in the discussion and where we are. I note a couple of people who are currently waiting. I wondered since you offered that whether Sally wanted to add anything at this stage? Sally Costerton. I cannot hear anyone. You might be muted Sally.

SALLY COSTERTON: Sorry, to unmute it's star 7.

CHAIR: Okay, not working at the moment. I see that Sally Costerton is typing, not at the **[inaudible 00:12:53]** link. Okay, right, you might be able to speak through Adobe Connect if you connect your microphone. In the meantime, while this gets worked out let's have Eduardo Diaz. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Hello, I just wanted to give you some, you know expand of what Sebastien was saying about some of the things that we have been hearing from the different ACs and ASOs just to get the conversation going.

One of the things we have been hearing is also the shape of the rooms. Right now we have U-shapes inside the rooms and one of the **[inaudible 00:13:42]** becoming so big that the requirements for the rooms are getting bigger and bigger and bigger and some of the things that are happening is that places to hold that type of shape are not available everywhere.

Also, yesterday we were talking about the GNSO and for us and I think there was a comment made about the four days that we have for the ICANN meeting and I remember hearing that maybe the annual meetings, we can expand it one more day. That is something that I never... That was a very interesting idea. Just because you people are coming in and other things are happening during that meeting.

Across everybody we have talked about, they believe ICANN meeting are very, very busy and very, very long. In fact they were saying that when people were coming to the ICANN meetings on the professional level and the personal level, they have to make this arrangement and say, "I'm going to this meeting for seven days." "What kind of meeting is that?" And also there were very interesting things in Durban we have very interesting brainstorming ideas and one that came back to me that sounded very interesting is that you sort of have the public forum at the end of the ICANN meeting, to have one at the beginning, like Monday so people could... There will be more people attending it and there is the chance for the week, during the week to answer some of the things that happened or asked during the public forum and then have another one on Thursday.

These are all the things that I wanted to share with just you to give you some of the insight of the things that we are hearing and just to motivate some conversation within this meeting. Thank you, that's all.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Eduardo, quite fascinating to hear, yes. And I can hear Sally Costerton in the background so why don't you have the floor. Go ahead.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you Olivier. Sorry about that slight technical snafu. Hello, everybody. Thank you for making this **[inaudible 00:15:57]** for this group. This group has been working really hard to try to: A, work out what are the right questions to ask, one of the most central of which has been what the is the purpose of an ICANN meeting. Which funnily enough we have lots of different opinions about as well as some of the questions on logistics and things that dictate where we locate the meetings, how many rooms we have, what kind of – how we do the schedules and these kinds of issues.

So I would say the tenor, the tone of these discussions has been very open, very frank and **[inaudible 00:16:38]** very practical feedback to the central team so that we can understand what are the absolute must haves. You can't give them up for any reason, you couldn't possibly change them for these reasons. And one of the things that actually might have just become a habit but that might in fact not be so important to the groups that we're talking to and that has thrown up a lot of really useful insight about whether there might be some flexibility

to allow us to improve things so that was really what I wanted to contribute to this call and I hope that's helpful.

CHAIR:

That's great and thank you very much Sally. That certainly is and it provides us with an even fuller picture, I think. I can see Tijani's hand up so Tijani you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. First of all I'd like to say that I asked for this meeting, for this call because I sensed during our meeting in Durban that we, the At-Large representatives, didn't have a similar point of view on specific points so it was good to know even if Sebastien said we are working on behalf of our own person we are not representing At-Large. That's right but I think it's good to know what the Global At-Large think about those points. This is something very important for me so that we can perhaps continue working with something clear for us.

The points, the tracks, we had two tracks mainly for the beginning was the purpose of the meeting but after that we touched three main points if you want, that we need to discuss.

The first one is the number of meetings per year. The second is the rotation and the criteria for the rotation and the third is the meeting itself. It's length, the shape of the room etc., etc. and also the structure of the meeting, how it is organized.

Those are the three tracks and I would like that ALAC on behalf of At-Large give us the general point of view of ALAC so that we can work in the Working Group with this background, if you want.

So we have those points, also we discussed between Beijing and Durban, other points such as, for example, interpretation, visa, travel, etc. So those are points that we need also for the interpretation there were many different points of view inside of the At-Large representatives. So it is something that bothered me and I think that we need to have the point of view of the At-Large. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much Tijani and thank you very much for this additional bit of information. You are absolutely connect, this is what this meeting is really for and I guess we now have heard from many of the members of the Working Group about the background and what has been discussed so far and I guess we can really structure our discussion coming up now with regards to 1, the number of the meetings; 2, the rotation and criteria; and 3, the meetings and shape of the room and interpretation and these sort of overall weekly things.

I'm afraid though that we do have about, I would say 25, 30 minutes or so to work on this. I'm not sure we're going to be able to have a consolidated strategy on each one of these but certainly providing each one of your points of view would help ALAC Members in being able to make a decision and to find some kind of consolidation in the next few months.

Just before we start the discussion I wanted to ask from Sebastien if I could have or if we could have actually, the overcall schedule of the forthcoming milestones of this Working Group. Is there going to be a public comment period? When, how, etc.? Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you Olivier. Yeah, we are adapting with that, but my current proposal to the Working Group is the following: we will have the 10th of September first draft to be discussed. We will discuss it the 12th of September and the 19th of September within the Working Group. And then the next Thursday I will, or Friday, I will give a presentation to the Board. Hopefully the Board will agree with the way we are working and maybe add some issue or some point of view and the goal is to have as soon as possible beginning of October document published for comment period and you have 42 days and we will land a few days before Buenos Aires and I imagine that we will be able to have some additional discussion during Buenos Aires.

That's what I am quite confident we will do. We are trying to see when we are able to have our... We will have two days after face to face meetings to consolidate the inputs from the comment period and the work will be done in Buenos Aires sometime beginning of December. And hopefully we'll be able to come either with some questions to specific groups, specific organization or we will be able to come with a kind of final document. I am not sure that it will be yet the final, final one but maybe the second version and to be discussed again within the Working Group during few weeks and then put again to comments if we think that it's necessary. At the moment I have quite clear view for

Buenos Aires for after Italy less clear for me. Hope it answers at least the beginning of your questions. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much Sebastien. Yes, absolutely. At least now we have an idea and I guess that our first target is going to be around early to mid September with first draft coming out and your soon community being particularly interested in this.

So, starting with the discussion part of this meeting, as I said earlier, the first tricky question was the number of meetings per year and with this, a couple of the members of the Working Group have shared their point of view with me.

Tijani has come forth to me and shared one point of view and Sandra Hoferichter has also shared a slightly different vision. I thought that I would ask both Tijani and Sandra, and starting with Tijani, as to what their point of view with regards to the number of meetings per year. And that's the number, let's be sure, the number of ICANN meetings per year, the full circus as one would call it. Tijani, could you please share your point of view with us?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you Olivier. I do think that we would still need three meetings per year. As you all know we are very crowded during those three meetings now. We are crowded and you are not able to attend all the meetings because we have overlapping.

Some people said, "Why don't do some of this virtually?" But we are doing very much virtually. Sometimes we do more than one call per day the whole week. It is not something that we can do and we don't want to do but we need also with the virtual or online discussion we need also the face to face discussion. We have our own work but we need more cross constituency interaction and my point of view is that if there is an evolution we have to **[inaudible 00:25:58]** more interaction between the constituencies. It is very important. We are doing now a lot of effort but we can do more.

Second thing, the other proposal of Sandra is to do two meetings and one regional meeting. If each constituency do one regional meeting, if you do the sum of all that, you are not gaining any dollar, on the contrary, you would pay more. It's not better and you'd have the effort divided so the Staff would have more than one meeting instead of one meeting they will have a lot of meetings besides the two.

So I think that we need to keep **[inaudible 00:26:50]** remind you that at the beginning of ICANN there was four meetings per year and when ICANN decided to reduce them to three, we have now a year and we have now the weekend and if we reduce the ICANN meetings perhaps we'll have more other meetings and perhaps we'll have less **[inaudible 00:27:18]** in the ecosystem. So there is a lot of consideration but at least for the, if you want, the practical point of view, we now today we are struggling. It is difficult for us to do what we want to do during the meetings. If we drop one, we will have more difficulties. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Tijani and I will now call on Sandra Hoferichter to share her point of view. Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier. First of all can you hear me because I have not the best conditions here?

CHAIR: Yes Sandra, I certainly can. I guess everyone else should be able to hear you quite well.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay perfect, thank you. Tijani is absolutely right, there is a big challenge for all stakeholder groups. I experienced that in the previous calls we had with a other stakeholder groups the challenges are there's too much work for each cycle and too less time for interaction with other stakeholder groups.

My proposal actually is to stretch at least at one time of the year these two issues because the groups have so many different needs and so many different schedules that it's really hard to accomplish both needs to get the work done and to meet with other stakeholder groups in the global ICANN meeting.

Instead we should allow stakeholder groups and constituencies to meet one time of year or according to their needs but I would say for the moment maybe one time of the year or two times to meet and only

concentrate on the work of the policy work they want to do - policy discussion, policy work interaction with their own constituencies.

Whilst the global ICANN meetings can be done more effectively used to interact with other constituencies. I hope other representatives from other stakeholders groups, they think this could be a solution indeed because looking at the GAC for instance. They are sitting behind closed doors so many times. Actually if we don't see them why do we have them during the ICANN meeting? It would be more work, would be more useful, they meet somewhere in a smaller venue and then come to the ICANN meetings that are open and ready to explain their policy, to explain their communique and so on and so forth.

I wanted to give you another example. We recently had the EURALO General Assembly back to back with the Lisbon meeting in the European meeting in **[inaudible 00:30:24]** and this was funded by ICANN and we are very happy we could invite more or less 80% of our European membership.

It was much an intensive and effective meeting because really we could always reach out to our own membership and we could really do some of the policy work which is so important because the other, we are only 15 people and there is so much work on the shoulders of 15 people so that I think for our constituency it's so necessary to get work divided on all the other At-Large structures and members of the **[inaudible 00:31:02]** But for this reason we have to meet them, we have to engage them at least one a year and then come back to the ALAC meeting, deliver the message from our region, for our stakeholder group and getting it implemented into the overall At-Large ALAC policy.

Whilst we can use the ICANN meetings much better or even more than we do it now for the interaction with the other constituencies which is so necessary and so much demanded. So I would opt for having two meetings per year plus one or two depending on the need of the stakeholder group, one or two individual meetings which are much smaller than the big ICANN circus.

Another observation I made looking at this recent Durban meeting. We had huge rooms and sometimes there were only two or three people or six people sitting in the room. When we look at what kind of facilities ICANN is providing and how badly is it sometimes used because the people which are interested in a specific topic, it's quite a small group but still they are sitting in huge room with all the technical facilities, all the interpretation facilities and it's actually also not a good feeling to sit there in such a big room. It would be better to have a smaller room instead. So these are my points and I will be happy to explore and answer questions on them. Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Sandra for this point of view which differs slightly in Tijani's point of view. I saw earlier that Eduardo Diaz had put his hand up. I wonder whether he could share some of his points of view with regards to the number of meetings were year.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, sorry, my computer went off. I believe this question about three, two, four times a year even within the ALAC you will see different points

of view and when you talk to other people, other constituencies see things so they get different perspectives of what they want.

I still believe that we should stay with the three times a year **[inaudible 00:33:37]** and see how that goes. I also understand what Sandra is saying about she thinks an example the GAC, that you don't see them during the ICANN meeting at all. They were in a room over there so you know why do they do that in the ICANN meeting and they don't do that outside and then they come back? That's something they can do.

Heard also from other constituencies that said, "You know, we don't really have to be at the ICANN meeting to do our work. We can come to the ICANN meeting just to report," and I think that was the other organization that said that. We can meet around the organization and just come back to ICANN proposal.

So at this point we have to look at all these points of view and see how we can juggle this but I still believe three times a year sounds like a good flow of needs. It's just that we need to arrange what goes on in those meetings so we have time to talk especially across constituencies. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much Eduardo and I was going to actually ask Sally Costerton a question with regards to those three meetings a year or maybe Sebastien could provide us an answer. Why is there such a question basically regarding having those three meetings per year? Why is this put into question? Very open question by the way.

Sebastien Bachollet, you put your hand up. Go ahead. You might be muted at the moment.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Now I am unmuted.

CHAIR: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I really think that we need to be careful not to mix two points here in the discussions. The number of the meeting and the organization of the meetings, it's two different topics I think and why it's so important is because you have people with big voice who are activating their network to go to two meetings because they think that it will be better. And it's an obvious question. We have to put on the table and to discuss it.

The question of how the week is organized today from my point of view it's even more important. I would very much encourage the discussion about how we can do better in the time we have during a week.

The question of the GAC, it's quite interesting to say that what you say Sandra is that it's behind closed doors because in fact it was really worse before. It was really always behind closed doors. Now they are meeting open. Now the problem is how you interact with them as when their door open as when the other SOL ACR are also meeting.

It may raise a question about how we want to better organize this cross constituency work. You, as ALAC, you have meeting with the other ASO NOCs, also is it well organized? Is it at the right time? It's such question I would like very much to have your input now.

Of course, we get from the people who still think that we need three meetings, it's important because the work flow is here, the number of topics. If you organize a single meeting with HSO NAC to discuss policy, are you sure it will be at a good time to discuss the right issue?

It's always tricky when you organize a meeting in one place for a certain period. It's maybe not a right time to have the real discussion then if everyone's on the same boat it will be hopefully everyone will be on the same page.

I also understand that people, there's a time consuming, they are tired and all of that but what Tijani say about the fact that yes, we used to have four. Four was a little bit rush always. You have to remember the last one meeting of the year was always in Los Angeles because it was a General Assembly and the General Assembly at the beginning had to be organized in that quarter of the city place of the headquarter of ICANN and then if we take all that into account, we all ready as ICANN have an experience of going back to the same city.

We have the experience of more meetings and if you look at last year, I would like very much to understand if you thought that we could avoid to have the Durban meeting because we had two meetings in the last fiscal year. We will have four this year because one not in June but in

July. But just imagine if we would have cancelled Durban and go directly to Buenos Aires.

At the global perspective, do you think that it will be feasible and we will have enough interaction and discussion? That's some points still on the discussion but I would like very much that we go to the other discussion about the meeting organization itself because if we thought we are better there maybe the question of the two, three, four meetings will be not so much difficult to understand. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much Sebastien for this and certainly I think it's become pretty clear that the several options here are three meetings per year of three full ICANN meetings per year or two ICANN meetings and then perhaps something specifically for some of the SOs and **[inaudible 00:41:06]** community.

I've also heard suddenly the possibility for two global ICANN meetings plus General Assembly as well for each one of our RALOs that the ICANN circus is not going to visit through that year.

There's so many different avenues and you're quite right, we're not going to find a solution now but I think it's good to put the different solutions on the table. Sally Costerton, you're now able to speak. My question to you was: why is there this big question mark about these three ICANN meetings per year so we could continue like this couldn't we?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you. Yes, Olivier, we absolutely can. I think Sebastien said it well, this group has been empowered to look at all sorts of things with no specific destination. It may well be that this group evaluates all the options and says, "Everything's great. We leave it as it is." But let me be clear, there were three, as it were buckets of different issues and it's very easy to conflate them but we should avoid it.

One is frequency of meetings, the second one is location of meetings and sort of rotation of meetings and the third one is the schedule of the meetings and are really different and they need very different kinds of solutions and sometimes one affects the other.

Clearly if you pick a city which is very small and has a very small venue and doesn't have very many rooms, you have more limit on the amount of parallel meetings you can run. So the good news is you have fewer conflicting sessions, the bad news is that fewer people can probably go to the meeting.

So one of the things we've been really trying to address in this group is almost just resorting to try to prioritize some of the feedback. And the Working Group asking the SOAC groups assuming that no one ever gets everything they want in life. Which is the most important thing to you? Is it the kind of room layout you have? Is it the length of the meeting? Is it the location of the meeting? Is it having fewer conflicts on the schedule? Not because anyone has a predetermined view that there should be three meetings or two meetings or four meetings or any other number but because this is the process of the committee is to evaluate these different aspects and I hope that's helpful.

CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much Sally. One of the questions that I have been asked or was suggested to me was: is this sustainable if we continue growing? Is this model scalable especially if one wants to keep a full rotation?

SALLY COSTERTON: I think the answer to that Olivier is probably no especially if we want to keep a full rotation because if we keep things exactly as they are now the biggest limitation is the format of the rooms which Eduardo was talking about at the beginning of the call. Specifically the demand for the GAC and the gSNO to have U-shaped tables, very very space intensive, demands simultaneous translation, the visa requirements, there were probably only two or three venues in Africa that today can accommodate an ICANN meeting and as those constituency groups expand, say you have 30% more government from the GAC which would be in many ways a very good goal but gives us significant headaches in terms of how we, what venues are actually available to us. So for that reason, if for no other reason, the answer is probably we are almost certainly reaching our limit if you want to continue the rotational model as it stands at the moment.

CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much for this Sally. I notice and I was going through all the different points of view of all the different members of the Working Group that we had there. Before I turn to Tijani I was going to give the floor first to Silvia Herlein for her point of view maybe

specifically on the number of meetings since we are dealing with this at the moment and also to Satish Babu if he's able to speak. So, shall we have Sylvia Herlein Leite please?

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE:

Hello, yes Olivier. It's difficult to try to hear everybody. As Tijani says, three meetings per year would be a good number but we also need to hear what Sandra says, that we really need more local meetings. So if we could manage a way to have local meetings, for example one General Assembly per year per region it would be a great thing.

So I think we need to hear all the constituencies and try to find a balance. But I think I need to agree with Tijani that three per year is a good number because when we have an ICANN meeting with all the constituencies, we are able to be in touch with them.

So even the GAC is too busy and they are always altogether. It's difficult to be in touch with them if we only have two per year it would have been more difficult so I must agree with the Tijani idea and I think three per year and try to find maybe a way to have one local meeting per year to do our General Assembly it would be the best way to do it. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much Sylvia, and Satish Babu are you able to speak? At the moment I can't hear you. Satish Babu? I can hear someone typing suddenly but I can't hear Satish. Okay, let's go back to the queue then. Tijani Ben Jemaa and then Sandra Hoferichter. Tijani go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. I think that we have to make real difference between the global ICANN meeting and regional meetings or the constituency meetings. It is not the same at all. We don't do the same thing in those meetings. We are discussing now the number of ICANN global meetings so some think that there must be three, other think there must be two. It is not my point here.

My point is that a regional meeting or a constituency meeting doesn't replace a global meeting - at all. And if this is clear for us we can go and discuss further. If we try to replace a global meeting by a regional or constituency meeting we will go more in the silo spirit while we are trying to break the silos.

So first it will cost more because you'll have a multitude of meetings rather than one. And the second point, it would be more in silos than interaction spirit. This is the first point.

The second point for me, the main thing we have to discuss is the organization of the meeting. I do agree with you, with Sally, with everyone that we need to change that. For example, the Durban meeting was perhaps the worst one I have attended because we had more overlaps.

Imagine we had an overlap between two African meetings. This is something that is not acceptable, I think and I understand that the staff is doing their best but we need to have sufficient ahead so that they can plan so people who want to have meetings during the global meeting have to express their intentions sufficiently ahead of the meetings so

the staff can arrange something that will not overlap the same interest if you want. For sure there is always overlap but it is not a problem to have an overlap between a GAC meeting and ALAC meeting everyone, is doing their work. It's not a problem but if there is something which is for a common interest between two constituencies, it is better not to have them at the same time.

So this is one point that we have to take care very, very carefully in the future. Also we have to rethink how we structure the meeting. I think that something can be done so we can have perhaps a little bit more time because we save the time. We don't duplicate, for example when staff member come and present something for this constituency and then go to other constituency and then to the other and then to the other. We cannot run something to have more than one constituency hearing this presentation. Perhaps the constituencies have different interests and will have even question but this is not the problem to share it with the other constituencies. Those are ideas but I think we can dig more and deeper to have better organization of the meetings. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Tijani. While Satish is still typing, I'll have Sandra Hoferichter first.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier. I agree with Tijani in the point that we have to organize the meetings in a better way. And I think this is one of the talk of new Meeting Strategy Working Group. However the big question is

one meeting, two meetings, three meetings or even no meetings but this is not an option.

I disagree with Tijani in that point that if we cut it down to two plus X meetings and with X I mean the regional or stakeholder group meetings put us more into silos. If we improve the interaction during the global meetings it would even foster interaction and would get us out of our current silo structure. If we get the time to sit in our silo at one time in a year but using the opportunity in a proper way to interact with the other constituencies during the global meetings, I think this is of much more value.

I also do not agree in terms of higher costs. We have far, far less infrastructure for a small meeting for like 50 people providing always the big conferences, the big hotels and so on and so forth. We might have a bigger demand on staff but I guess for a regional meeting, a lot of staff can even participate remotely because we proved it at Durban recently and it worked perfectly.

Another point, the time between the first and the second meeting is always too short. I hear that from staff side. We see this, we have problems to get the work done from leaving the first meeting and ending or starting to prepare the second all ready and also for me personally and I heard this from many people, being away on a voluntary basis away from my family, away from my job three times, 10 days a year I can definitely not extend that having three meetings plus another regional meeting.

On the other hand I consider to include, our push to include the very basic structure so essential to get, to strengthen the ALAC, to distribute the amount of work to more people and to make the ALAC, the At-Large specifically in particular more accountable. But stay away from me to have an additional meeting which is then a regional one. And I heard this from many other people as well that the time, the amount of time we are spending on ICANN meetings is higher than the amount of time you are spending with your family on vacation. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much Sandra and I will now read the comments which Satish Babu has put in the chat since he is unable to speak.

“First, I agree that three global meetings a year is the maximum we can do and the minimum we need. Second, the organization of the meeting has to reflect the priorities and preferences of the At-Large community, for example, internal meetings versus inter-constituency meetings. Third the At-Large community has limitations in terms of travel, visas etc. that other constituencies do not have and these need to be addressed.

And finally the At-Large community can of course use more local meetings especially when coupled with capacity building. In summary, the quantity of the meetings can remain the same but the quality, in other words the way the meetings are organized, need to be enhanced.”

And this is something of course that Sebastien has alluded to something we should discuss here. I guess we have another five, ten minutes to discuss this specifically. I'm not sure we are going to reach any consensus on the number of meetings per year but at least with this recording the At-Large Advisory Committee will be able to see the different points of view as discussed and that will certainly make them a lot more aware when this community is going to have to provide some feedback on the 10th of September.

So I guess with regards to the organization of the meeting itself, I can see there is something to do. Should we have more cross community meetings? One of the things which has come up when I was asked was, "Well, can you actually move the Working Group Meetings somewhere else rather than having them at the time of an ICANN Meeting?" And my answer was, "Well, they do need to meet face to face," so it's a complicated thing.

Sally, I still see you've got your hand up actually. I'm not sure whether this was a follow up that you wanted to add, Sally Costerton.

SALLY COSTERTON: Sorry, I should have taken my hand down.

CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So the question here and I guess Sebastien Bachollet you've asked the question, how do we organize the week better? And frankly I have myself just thought about this very carefully and it's a bit of a headache.

I've heard the notes that have been shared by Tijani on this. The way that our meetings are built is not easy because the booking of the rooms etc. all needs to be done in advance and we need to make sure that things are done in a certain way.

Could I perhaps ask Heidi to let us know: how does this build up of the meetings actually work when we have a meeting that's with other communities, when we have meetings that are inside our own community etc. because I think that there are also some technical bounds to do with that.

One of the reasons being that two months before an ICANN Meeting takes place, Heidi and I build a very light schedule and think, "Okay this one is going to be a lot more relaxed," and for some reason when the meeting actually takes place, I cannot remember the time of the day or night. It just looks like a huge long tunnel.

Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Olivier. The process is basically that each of the ACSO support groups work with their particular community members, primarily chairs and do exactly what you described Olivier, we have an initial discussion of agendas.

Then we all submit meeting confirmation forms which indicate the title, the time, the technical requirements, whether interpretation is required, etc. Those are submitted and then compiled by the meeting staff then there are a couple of meetings with all of the support group

staff and meeting staff that go over these agendas and starting to put the puzzle together. And then as the meeting draws closer, then the agendas are developed in consultation with the community groups and then there's a final meeting with meeting staff and you could say that's the process.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Heidi. So how do we end up then with the type of problem that Tijani has mentioned, the overlapping of meetings and everyone running around like a head less chicken? Heidi, that's a question.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry, could you repeat that please?

CHAIR: Okay, thank you for providing us with the full details of how in theory things work but then how do we then end up with overlaps between, as Tijani said, the different Africa meetings and basically people having to run from meeting to meeting because so many of them overlap each other?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, that's a very good question. I would like to know the answer to that. I think primarily it is because these various support groups put in their meeting confirmation forms and we don't see all... Sometimes they're last minute and we don't see. And sometimes during those

review meetings, should sit around and it's just difficult to see all of these two hundred meetings to keep up with when they are all being held and that's where conflicts occur. And also there are also sometimes last minute meetings as well.

CHAIR: Okay, thank you for this. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. I think that if we do as the finance department did, if we elaborate some place for meeting request that everyone can use. Put on the website and everyone can use to request for a meeting with a clear deadline sufficiently ahead of the meeting so that the staff can arrange.

The problem is that the requests are expressed very late so some meetings are all ready fixed and other meetings have to happen so how will they arrange? They try their best but they cannot always avoid such overlapping.

So if the requests are expressed sufficiently ahead of the meeting, I am sure that the staff will find a way to avoid the bad overlapping because there is always overlap but we need, I think they have the same level of interest for several communities or several stakeholders not to overlap together. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you Tijani. Heidi is there a master document for all the meetings taking place and how soon do we usually send our requests?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, very good question because yes there is a master list that staff **[inaudible 01:03:28]**. That list is not complete and as Tijani mentioned, there are always additional meetings last minute. There are also shifts as I mentioned before then as more and more meetings get put into that overall master schedule then staff see it again and again more discussion about whether there's conflicts etc. More shifts are made and then finally when the final program is posted, there is only about a month or so prior to the meeting so it is relatively late.

What you get then is as meetings are, like the last meetings Beijing and Durban were so close together that it all happened in such a compressed time that there's very little time to do all of that, to get a perfect, unconflicted meeting schedule.

So that's another big issue that when there's just not enough time and all this demand for meetings, it is very difficult to get meetings scheduled that's going to be unconflicted for a particular topic for a particular ASCO.

CHAIR: Okay thank you for this Heidi. Sally Costerton, you have the floor.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you Olivier. Just on top of what Heidi said, all of which is absolutely right, there is another issue in here which is very challenging and that is that there is a view expressed by the soft support groups very strongly express that their stakeholders have preferences as to when they have the meetings and those preferences are typically A, now and B, all the same.

So I held meetings that I chaired personally before Durban to try to deconflict the schedule and as you can see that was not very successful. And the primary reason for that is that typically stakeholders, the easy ones are the small nonconflicted meetings, those get done really quickly but the amount of meetings where the stakeholder groups want the nonconflicted box in the main room and they want it at a particular time of day.

So they want it before about 4 p.m. in the afternoon and after about 8:30 a.m. in the morning. And what happens is we now have a very disproportionate amount of requests for those slots and that's why we had so many conflicts at Durban because the demand for meetings has gone up be the tolerance of spread for when those meetings should take place is no different. So that's another really complicating factor in all of this.

CHAIR:

Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And if I could add just one more thing that I've noticed a change in At-Large as well as adding what Sally mentioned.

CHAIR: Yes Heidi, now that you've introduced yourself, you may speak.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. What I've mentioned before to the ALAC is that over the last few meetings the request for ALAC meetings has gone up from 60 minutes to 90 minutes so not only do we have more meetings, more working groups requesting meetings, more RALOs requesting meetings, they're now 90 minute requests sometimes even two hours.

For example the multi-stakeholder so that's a new tradition meeting for ALAC, a very good meeting but that's two hours so again we're getting more meetings and longer durations so again that's just going to result in conflicts in terms of other meetings and in terms of even At-Large meetings. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Heidi but as I see actually we are 10 minutes past the hour so that's pretty much one of the problems as we spend just a couple more minutes. This is all implementation and Sebastien alluded more to policy earlier. The policy of how these could be structured.

I wonder if Sebastien Bachollet could share the points of view on the policy, how these meetings could be arranged now that he's actually

heard the challenge with regards to the implementation of this policy.
Sebastien Bachollet?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you Olivier. It's still a bit early for me to come to some conclusion but my... What I would like to try as Chair of this Working Group is to try to see how we can organize things to help to decrease first the conflict but also help to what it's I heard that by every group I would say including the GAC to have cross SOAC work. And I think we need to have some thinking outside of the box and take a new look at that. I am starting to think about that. I write some notes of a meeting but of course even if I have a not too bad knowledge of how those meetings are organized, I don't have all the information but it's really very, very difficult.

Even if you have the same type of meeting from one location to another one it's, at the end of the day each group may ask for something a little bit different then we have to also to see how we can keep some flexibility.

One thing that was alluded during the discussion and could be really interesting to see a little bit more is that we need three meetings, just think it's international full meeting but can we organize different meetings? Is the IGM could be different? I would just take one or two examples. It could apply to everybody I guess.

At the end of the AGM we have all the groups to sit our new team, the ALAC, the **[inaudible 01:10:37]**, the Board and so on. How do we do that? Everybody does that a little bit differently. We end up as the Board to

do that on Thursday evening now. You do that I guess on Friday morning. The gNSO is considering to do that on Friday morning.

Then my question is that is it this AGM could be differently organized than the other one? And to a different topics, to push the idea a little bit more and it's not to say it's the way we are going. It's just an idea.

Maybe we can decide that the first two meetings of the year it's meeting to discuss policy and the third one is to decide about policy. I know what I am saying is crazy but it is just to push you to have ideas outside of what is currently done to try to see if collectively we can come with new ideas, with new way of doing things.

We may decide to have the first meeting to have more side silo work and some make changes. The second must be really focused on exchange between SONACs and the third one about decisions.

I really think that if we want to stay where we are, with all the complexity of the meeting and all the requirements, we will not be able to do it except if we do each meeting like ITU [inaudible 01:12:36] with three weeks of meetings or four weeks of meetings and I am sure there are people on this call who will not be happy with that. We need to find something else, something different and your idea will be really very welcome. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you, thank you very much Sebastien Bachollet. I note that we are 15 minutes past the top of the hour which means this call really should be adjourned in a moment.

Just before adjourning I wanted to thank all of you for coming on this call. We do need an Action Item and I think this Action Item is for At-Large staff to publicize the recording of this call.

I have noted there are quite a few ALAC members, members of the committee itself that are missing from the call for various reasons. One of it being that it is Friday and part of the world is all ready on Saturday and there is also **[Eat? 01:13:43]** that is being celebrated. That's the Muslim part of the world celebrating the equivalent to Christmas I think, or Easter.

So there were quite a few people who were not able to make it and Action Item therefore to publicize the recording of this call in advance of the next ALAC meeting that will take place at the end of August where there will be a very brief discussion at that time of ALAC members but no introduction at all because I will assume that everyone is well aware now of all the issues.

This call certainly has really helped. I certainly have found it helpful to find out about all the issues. I hope you all have as well. I see Sally Costerton still has her hand up. Sally, would you like to say a few last words?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Yes, Olivier. I just wanted to thank everybody who took place in this and so generous with their ideas and thoughts. It's really extraordinarily helpful and I hope that people will feel really well listened to and engaged by the process and certainly I know that talked about it has been a really helpful call so thank you for giving up your Friday

mornings, afternoons, evenings, Saturday mornings, whatever it is on our behalf.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much Sally. Thank you Sebastien. Thank you the members of the Working Group whether it's Satish, Tijani, Sandra, Sylvia or Eduardo.

Our future regarding ICANN meetings lies in your hands so we're very glad that you're able to spend all the time working on these issues which are of course extremely important for this community.

And to all of you without any further ado, it is 18 minutes past the hour. I thank all of you for having been in this call and I wish you a very good weekend. This call is now adjourned. Thank you and bye-bye.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Bye-bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Bye-bye.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Adios.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]