GISELLA GRUBER: We're going to get the recording started now and I'm going to do a quick roll call. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's At-Large Ad Hoc New Meeting Strategy Drafting Team Call on Thursday, 23rd of July at 14:00 UTC. On today's call we have Beran Gillen, Maureen Hilyard, Eduardo Diaz and Alan Greenberg, Yasuichi Kitamura, Sébastian Bachollet, Alan Greenberg. Apologies noted from Sandra Hoferichter, Satish Babu, Holly Raiche, Heidi Ullrich and Vanda Scartezini.

From staff we have myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you, Beran. Beran has dropped. Otherwise, Maureen, if you'd just like to pick up from where you left off, to have it on record, with regards to inviting the additional Members to the next Meeting, the ccNSO and GNSO, as well as getting people to contribute to the think tank… Tijani has sent an apology as he's on another call. Over to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Just on the [unclear 02:25]…

GISELLA GRUBER: I'm going to mute Beran. Sorry. Over to you Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Beran, do you want to take over now? Or would you like me to continue? Okay, I'll continue. Just while we were waiting for the call to start, I had raised that I'd really appreciate it if we could have representatives from the other SOs and ACs to this meeting, so that we're not duplicating effort and [unclear 03:23] unnecessarily. If we could note down an Action Item for representatives to be invited to this meeting [unclear 03:43]. Similarly, I would really appreciate some more input into the think tank ideas. Sandra and I have monopolized, I think, the think tank, by [FAQs] comments would be very helpful.

But if we could actually have more people contributing to that work space it would make it a lot more productive for us to try and get some ideas through that. Thank you. Beran?

GISELLA GRUBER: Maureen, Sébastian had his hand raised. Beran, I'm not sure if you're able to participate at this stage. If you're not then I'll hand the floor over to Sébastian.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you Gisella. I understand your point, Maureen, but I think it's also very important that we, as At-Large, set out our needs and push for our needs. Then to have a cross-community working group, maybe we need to ask the Board to resuscitate the Meeting Strategy Working Group to do a follow up job, to follow what's happened in the various SO/ACs and so on.

I get that we need to have input from others, but to be able to have input from others, they need to have done some internal work, and I'm not sure that as yet we are able to give our own view on what we want to do on A, B and C meetings. I really think we need to do that prior to having a cross-community working group. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Sébastian. No, I agree. When I said a cross-community working group, probably not at this particular stage. I think however that while we're actually putting our ideas together, it would be really helpful to get some idea, some contribution, of what sort of things others are doing, so that we're actually not duplicating the efforts, that's all. Also, I was a little bit interested in what expertize and language expertize they had within their organizations that might be helpful to us, especially in the various areas which they might be covering.

But probably just inviting them to a meeting, to give us a general idea of what it is that they're proposing to do for both outreach and inreach, to give us… We are already starting to establish some ideas, but I think that one of the things that we don't want to do is to be sending people out and going to the same… We were thinking of sending people out to a university perhaps; that the university has us one day, and the GNSO the next day, and the ccNSO the next day. It just sounds a little bit duplicative, to be doing that with the community. That would be the only reason for the suggestion. Thank you. Is Beran available?

GISELLA GRUBER: Maureen, Beran is on the audio bridge. Beran, are you able to join us now? Let me check that your line is unmuted. Sébastian? Over to you.

BERAN GILLEN: I'm sorry. I'm having a really bad connection today.

GISELLA GRUBER: Welcome Beran. Sébastian had his hand raised. Do you wish to say a few words before we hand the floor over to Sébastian?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes please. Thank you Gisella, and my apologies. I think I gave Gisella the wrong number. I'm travelling right now so my number keeps changing. I apologize profusely. Thank you everyone. I know it's a very small meeting. I see Alan has just joined us from the CCWG Meeting, and so has Sébastian. I just wanted to bring up a few items that were discussed in the last meeting.

We didn't really have any Action Items, but there's one thing that Vanda wrote on the page, which I wanted us to discuss. I don't know how far we've gone with the Agenda, Gisella. Have we moved onto Eduardo or Maureen?

GISELLA GRUBER: We haven't reached Eduardo yet. We've just got this call going because we had the connectivity issues and a fairly small group. I'm not sure if

Alan is already listening to us. I know that Tijani's not on yet. The only person from the CCWG who seems to have switched over is Sébastian.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay. Have you started the recording? The AC connectivity is not that good.

GISELLA GRUBER: Beran, that's already been done, 11 minutes ago. We were into the discussion. Maybe Maureen would like to give you a quick update on that. Eduardo is also on the call, even though he's not on the AC. Sébastian still has his hand up. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: All right. Maureen, then you have the floor. Please go ahead. I know I'm a bit late, I apologize. Maybe you can give me a short two-minute update. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Beran. I had just raised and was in discussion with Sébastian - and I think this is one of the reasons why he's got his hand up - I had suggested that at our next meeting we may have a representative from the GNSO and the ccNSO, just to get an idea, an impression, of what they are contemplating for their activity. I think I would find in my work space post that… It was just to get an idea of what they're doing, so that we can avoid duplication and unnecessary cost. It is a view that was shared by Vanda.

Also, my second point was to try and get more people contributing to the think tank ideas. Vanda and I seem to be monopolizing that at the moment, and I'd really appreciate other people's ideas. I would like to hear Sébastian's comment on this. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Maureen. I do have a bit to add to that, but I'll let Sébastian take the floor. Perhaps he might be able to shed some light on some questions, and then I'll add my bit.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you Maureen and thank you Beran. I wanted to suggest that maybe it would be more useful to have somebody from staff, who is from the Meeting Staff, to see what they have as input from all the other communities at once. I think it would be easier to have the discussion with them as part of ourselves, to try and find what will be the best way or the best use of our time for the next A, B, C Meetings. I actually think it would be easier than to have discussions with each and every SO and AC in our next call. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Sébastian. That was part of the reason why I actually added #2 to be discussed as part of the meeting. But unfortunately, looking at the Agenda, it seems the Meeting Staff were not available for this meeting. Gisella, perhaps at our next meeting you could get [Sandranicka 14:22] to join us for the meeting? Perhaps we can have that as an Action Item?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Beran, I think what Sébastian is suggesting is that the Meeting Staff take the lead in putting together all the ACs and SOs to try and figure out this, to make sure that we don't have [unclear 14:50]. I think that's what I understood.

BERAN GILLEN: Yes. I think also he was suggesting for them to join the call, or… Sébastian, please correct me if I'm wrong?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Beran, thank you. Yes, I agree with Eduardo. It would be good to have staff putting together all the proposals, but I think it would also be very important to have them come. For example, just one example - and maybe I'm totally wrong - but what if on Monday for the B Meeting they say, "By the way, there will not be any room available at the meeting facility, everything must be done outside; outreach to other groups, to other people," and whatever.

Of course that's not the reality, but it will be interesting and important to have those types of input from them. If they can't come to our next meeting then we have to try to find the bet date, to allow them to participate in one of our next meetings. We have to do it quite quickly, because Dublin is coming quite quickly.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Sébastian and Eduardo. That will be an Action item for the Meeting Staff, to be invited to our next call and also to help put together information with regards to the other SOs and ACs and what they're planning to do for the New Meeting Strategy. I just have something to add to what Maureen said earlier about reaching out to the other SOs and ACs. From our last call, Raf did say that during the Meeting in BA, the GNSO gave them a breakdown of what they plan to do for the Meeting B.

Is this cast in stone, or is this something that's likely to change? It's just something I'm putting out there, if anyone knows, or for those who were in the BA Meeting? Because I wasn't able to join that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can you repeat that question please?

BERAN GILLEN: I was just asking, in the last meeting when the SOs and ACs met, in Buenos Aires, in which Raf attended - I wasn't able to attend that meeting - I don't know if some of you guys, who were in that meeting, the GNSO did say that they are going to be concentrating more on inreach activities more than outreach for Meeting B. Do we then assume that they have already decided how they will be treating their Meeting B? Or is this something that's subject to change? That's my question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have an answer. Would you like to call on me?

BERAN GILLEN: I'm sorry Alan. My Internet's pretty spotty. Please, Gisella, help me - if there's anyone that has their hand up, if you could help me to get the line going. Please Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I may be a bit of cynic, but if you look at the GNSO plan, essentially it says they're doing what they're normally doing. That does translate to outreaches, either anyone from the local community can come and listen in on their regular sessions on Saturday, on the first day, or it's inreach and they're using that to help anyone who's in the room. Essentially, I don't see much difference between what they're planning and their business as usual.

So calling on the GNSO and asking them what they're doing, I don't think is going to be very helpful, if indeed we're trying to do something which is different from our past behavior. Someone else can comment on that. I may be a cynic, but that sure is how it looks to me. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Alan. I'm going to agree with you on that. I think Sébastian has his hand up. Sébastian, please go ahead. Thank you Alan.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I agree with Alan. The question is that the community proposal was not to do the job as usual in any of those meetings, and it's important that first, it's gathering the date when we, or the community,

is really working. That's why it includes the Saturday and the Sunday. The other point is that the changes of the A and C Meetings, for example with the two Public Sessions, need to show that it's changed something. Because if it's not changing anything then why are we doing all this?

For all the meetings, one of the ideas, very important, is to try and set up time where there is outreach with the community, the time for the work done within the AC or SO or each group of ICANN, and the other is when and for which topics we will have joint work, joint meetings. That's why for example in the first Public Session, it's important not to address only to the Board. It's to allow each group to raise issues and to allow those groups to do their work internally, but also if they raise the same type of issue then to have common work.

I know that it must be done prior, and in advance, but as we are never sure that the topic could be decided a very long time in advance, it's also a good way to exchange on those subjects. Then if for the moment GNSO is "work as usual", that's why we have to think about how we want to deal with that. For example, one of the ideas was to have the beginning of the day where we do our internal Working Group, our internal work - we and the others - and we have a time where we get together.

That time must be set up to allow different types of interaction; one between SOs and ACs on the set topic, one could also be with the regional meetings, with meeting the people from the different five regions, and also - but not the same meeting of course - to have a subdivision by the six or seven languages supported by ICANN, and to exchange on the topics that need to be exchanged by those groups. I

don't see how we can say, "Okay, everything will be work as usual and we don't care about the rest," because if we do so, we're not in line with what was suggested by the Working Group. Thank you. Sorry to be a little bit long.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Sébastian. I just wanted to add onto that. There is something that - I'm not sure whether it was Vanda, or Maureen added onto the Wiki - about properly linking up with the non-profit, NCUC or NPOC, and possibly reaching out to the NGOs in the regions, for the Meeting B Strategy. I think that's a wonderful idea, if we can organize that in line… And also add to that with the debate for the universities that Raf suggested. I think that's a wonderful idea. Maureen also suggests that in her Wiki. These are outreach activities I think we could also do in afternoons, as Sébastian suggested.

We have the meeting for ALAC internal work/inreach within the community, and then afternoons for outreach to universities, to other ALSes within the region, as well as to other NGOs. It's just something to think about. My Internet is back on now. Maureen has her hand up. Maureen, please, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Actually, you've raised some of the things I was actually going to talk about anyway, but I agree with… First of all, about the meeting in BA, which I didn't go to either, I was very interested in hearing back from Raf about that meeting. As Alan has explained, it was

very much GNSO just wanted to do their own thing, and they're not really interested in anyone else anyway.

But I think as Sébastian said, we've just got to look at how we can do things differently. As you say, as Sébastian mentioned, although it's not really our brief, because we're just supposed to be looking at outreach, but the different ways in which ALAC itself can actually do its work, but with other SOs and ACs within the organization of the rest of the week, also creates inreach and possible outreach opportunities as well. But yes, I think that one of the things - and Vanda and I have been discussing this - is what sort of possibilities there are for interaction.

My main concern was of course it depends on what the language of the community and how we can really effectively carry out those activities. For example, if it were in Latin America, I would feel like a spare wheel attending. I would enjoy it, I'm sure, but I'm quite sure how much I could contribute to any community outreach as such, apart from my presence, which may not be very much. Anyway, thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Maureen. I think a way to circumvent that could be to make sure that within the outreach we could actually pair with the Outreach and Engagement At-Large Sub Committee, and within that, I'm sure there will be a participant within each region from that Committee or from that Working Group, and they could be at the forefront of that outreach. That's just something off the top of my head. It seems we have mixed up #4 and #5 and completely skipped Eduardo and his Drafting Team from the schedule.

Alan, if you could intervene for one minute exactly and I'll give the floor to Eduardo. We are really behind. I think we've skipped #3 and gone into #4 and #5.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have less than one minute. I just wanted to clarify when I said the GNSO is doing their own thing, I meant regarding outreach. They are, I believe, subdividing the intra and inter things as prescribed. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Alan for that clarification. Eduardo, I am really sorry. Please go ahead and give us a run-down of the straw man schedule and what we have up-to-date. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: The straw man proposal that is in the Wiki, I'm on the road so I cannot see it, but the straw man page on the Wiki is the same straw man that I put there two, three meetings ago. The idea is to look at it and give ideas on what to do with that, in the sense of how to reschedule the dates. But talking about that, I went back to the Meeting Strategy original report that was put together, and one of the things we can try to do with this straw man idea for A, B and C, for outreach, is that we do work, inter work, between us in the morning, and in the afternoon we can do the intra work between us and other SOs/ACs.

That way we probably can discuss things in the morning that we may want to address in the afternoon with the SOs/ACs. If we have to come back later, the next day, we can do it in the morning and do internal

work. If we have to go back and discuss what we got from the previous afternoon, then we can go back and try to schedule another meeting with that SO and AC and expand whatever we want to expand on with them, if that would be the case.

That would probably be a strategy for how we do the meetings for A, B and C. I'm thinking here about the intra and inter work. If we agree that that would be a good strategy, then I can go back to the straw man polls, and the design idea and try to swap all the meetings around to see fit that makes sense. I don't know. Any ideas or questions?

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Eduardo. I have a suggestion. I don't know how… Earlier on in the discussion, when we first started meeting about this, I believe we agreed or discussed and said that Meetings A and C are not changing much. Am I right to say that this Meeting Strategy will be critically be looking at Meeting B, or are we looking at all meetings? I'm just throwing this on the floor right now. Anyone can take it up.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, can you repeat the question please.

BERAN GILLEN: What I'm saying is that Meeting A is not changing much - it's nothing different from what we're currently doing at ICANN Meetings. Meeting C is just an additional day, for which we agreed we can have most of the GAs that we wanted to have. Now, am I right to say then this Meeting

Strategy Drafting Team Working Group would only be critically looking at Meeting B? Am I right in saying that?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Sorry, your question is if we're just looking at Meeting B?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I think this Working Group has to look at A, B and C. The focus on B is that we're going to do only intra and inter week, and it's a very small week, but the main issue is with B, it's the outreach day, which is the first day… I don't know if I answered your question. The other ones, we need to then look at ways for us to do the internal work, plus external work, through the whole week, knowing that there will be some slots where there will be no meetings - they will be Public Forums and hot topics, things like that. Thanks.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Eduardo. I take it we'll be looking at all the meetings then. Maureen, did you want to say something?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Beran. No, I too wanted to get some clarification. I can understand what Eduardo is saying, in that this group will look at all of the meetings, because as you say, there is very little change for A and C,

and for B Meeting, as Eduardo's pointed out, it's got this one day that is quite specifically different from the other two meetings. That's one of the reasons why we've been focusing on that for the ideas - like how could we use one day to look at outreach?

Coming back to this recommendation that Vanda suggested, putting the different activities… Those activities are probably more activities for Meetings A and C, with screening the day and breaking it up. As Sébastian has already said, for Meeting B, we're really looking at probably getting everybody out and making it a real outreach day. It's how can we utilize everyone within the ALAC to be doing something different for Meeting B. So I guess for me, the clarification is what are we focusing on, first of all.

You were asking, should we keep looking at this Meeting B as a group, keep looking at this Meeting B and get some clarification so that we can proceed with something in Dublin, with some additional ideas, which will come out of it, no doubt, for Meetings A and C. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Maureen. This is my thought on the issue. I think Meeting A is exactly what is happening at ICANN Meetings right now, and I don't think much is changing. Ditto for Meeting C, apart from the GAs that we wanted to add onto it, inline with the AGM happening at the end of the year - correct me if I'm wrong. I believe we should put all our energies into Meeting B, because this is the complete change. It's something that's completely new, and we're looking at a completely different number of days, and everything changes.

That's the way I believe we should put our energies into it. They're my thoughts. Alan, Yasuichi or Sébastian, is there anything you want to add to that? Or what do you think of that? Please go ahead, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I agree with you that most of our energy should be put into Meeting B. If you look at what we've done in the past few meetings, we're talking about the outreach, and the main idea is out there. Because A and B, they look at regular ICANN Meetings with two or three changes - like the Public Forum is going to be twice during the week, and the other slots where there will be no meetings and we will talk about hot topics and things like that.

So we can eventually figure out what we want to do during the whole week, based on the Meeting Strategy. We have to look at the other meetings, because we have to submit this to the Meeting Staff, and they will somehow put this whole thing together. So we have to tell them what we're looking at. In any case, Meeting B is special, as you said, in the fact that it's not like a regular meeting, and mostly because of the first day. My suggestion is that the think tank put together a schedule for that day. Just come up with a proposal for that day, "This is what we're going to do at this time and at this time, and if we're going to have a debate we have a debate outside or inside.

"We need to get Global Engagement Staff in and do some meetings on engagement with the local ALSes or ISOC Chapters or whatever organizations are there." We should put it there. My suggestion is that the think tank put something together, whatever it is, and then we can

start talking from that, because there are many, many good ideas on the Wiki, but we have to somehow put in some kind of specific schedule. I would suggest to add an AI for the think tank to put something like that together. Then we can come back at the next meeting and talk about that, or talk about it [unclear 38:13]. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Eduardo. That's a wonderful transition into my next point actually. I'm going to combine #4 and #5 because I think we've been discussing it all around. I agree with Eduardo - I think we should come up with something more arranged. Perhaps we can put something together before the next meeting, which is probably going to be in a couple of weeks. If we could put something together for Meeting B, regarding inreach and outreach activities, I like Eduardo's or Sébastian's suggestion of having inreach in the morning - that is within ALAC having our meetings.

Then perhaps something to do with connecting the ACs and SOs in the mornings - and then have outreach in the afternoons, which would probably be either at university campuses where there is debates, or going out to NGOs, whether it's working with NPOC, or going out to our ALSes, be it within that country or within the region. That brings me to my next question: in the last meeting Alan did ask a question of whether we have any funding for outreach within the region. For example, say we're going to Marrakech for our Meeting B - this is hypothetical, by the way.

I do know Marrakech is a Meeting A - if it's Marrakech for Meeting B, do we have any funding from ICANN to actually do outreach within the region and not necessarily just limited within Marrakech. Gisella, could you maybe put that down as an AI, that is, if you can't answer the question?

GISELLA GRUBER: Beran, I'll note that as an AI, as no, I can't answer that question. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Gisella. So we're still within inreach and outreach. Maureen, should we have an AI for the think tank to come up with something by the next meeting? I think we should all pitch in, perhaps putting something together for Meeting B - the straw man's proposal, as Eduardo suggested?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Beran. Yes, I'd greatly appreciate some ideas from other people as well though. We should be able to put at least some ideas up, and maybe a list that we can pick and choose from, correct?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes, that's right Maureen. I think I'll have my hand up as a volunteer. You'll be getting some ideas from me with regards to the inreach and outreach and the structure of the meeting before the next meeting. Any other takers? Alan? I guess not. We'll move onto our next point. We

do have several minutes left. That's #6 - Meetings A and C, the approval dates and the closing ALT Meetings, et cetera. In our first maiden meeting, in which Alan chaired, something did come up that Heidi highlighted.

I don't know whether we got any clarification on it. This is regard to the ALT Meetings that we normally have on the last Friday. This [offers] some information that we had at the time from Heidi - please correct me if I'm wrong, Gisella - that the ALT Meetings were not possible anymore because the approval dates were likely to change for Meeting B, I believe, or was it Meeting A? Because the date was going to shift up. Could you perhaps shed some light on that Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Beran, do you mean the change of dates for Meeting A or B to accommodate the ALT? Is that it?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes, I think it was something to do with B, because [unclear 42:25] going to be included. I believe it was for Meeting B.

GISELLA GRUBER: Beran, as it stands now, the number of days allocated for the meeting are the number of days that we will have [stipulated 42:35], so there are no additional days.

BERAN GILLEN: So then we'll have to fit in the ALT Meeting within the four days then?

GISELLA GRUBER: We've got Alan who's raised his hand. I'm not sure if he's able to give any further insight into that.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Gisella. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Beran, at this point we have no clue. I'm still trying to find out who made this rule, and I haven't gotten an answer on that. Once I found out who made the rule, I'll know who to complain to.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Alan. Well, that moves us to the next point.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Sorry, this is Eduardo. I'm not in the Wiki, but if you look at the straw man proposal for Meeting B, there I put the ALT Meeting in the last day in the afternoon. Can you double-check that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Eduardo, you did, but that doesn't mean that's where it's going to be.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Oh, okay! Because it says four days, so that's where I put it anyhow. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Eduardo. I guess it would be a bit… You would need to know exactly how many days are approved and whether there would be an additional approval date. We would need to re-confirm that. So I guess Alan will have to get back to us on that before we can actually plug it in anywhere within the schedule. We could leave it tentatively on the last day of the Meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Beran, let me be clear. I wasn't pleased when I suddenly found out, at the last moment, that these new rules were imposed that we couldn't meet just before or just after the Meeting. Therefore I cannot really speak to whether we're going to honor it or not, because I don't know if it's a hard rule or something else. So I appreciate the frustration in not being able to plan as accurately as you want, but it's a shared frustration.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Alan. I believe the think tank will take that on board when we're drafting our proposal for the Meeting B schedule. That brings us to our next point, which is #7 - the next meeting. It will be Thursday, 6th of August, which is in two weeks exactly. Can we keep the same time? Is there going to be a clash? Would anybody mind keeping the exact

same time of 14:00 UTC? Or do you want to move it back to the original time of 15:00 UTC?

GISELLA GRUBER: Beran, just to say that 14:00 UTC is 04:00 for Maureen, so unless there's any major opposition for 15:00 UTC, that might be more suitable.

BERAN GILLEN: Yes, I agree.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I don't mind either time.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay. Sébastian, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Yes, but you changed topics. I'm okay with whatever time you want to have the meeting. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: All right, then Gisella I believe you can pen down Thursday 6th at 15:00 UTC.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Beran.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay, we're down to AOB. Does anyone have Any Other Business? I just wanted to clarify something I had mentioned earlier about outreach into the region. During the last meeting that we had, Alan brought up a point about whether ICANN has funding for outreach into the region where we'll be having the Meeting B. For example, if we have a meeting in Brazil, a Meeting B, and we want to do outreach to go within the region - that is the LAC region, and not necessarily stay within Brazil.

Is there any funding for that extra stretch or that extra mile that we want to do . I believe that's what Alan was asking. Alan, correct me if I'm wrong. That's what I understood from your point.

ALAN GREENBERG: I asked if there was any funding. We know that there was no funding allocated explicitly to ALAC, because we didn't ask for it, nor were we given any. Whether there is a pile of money associated with the outreach, I believe the answer we got, which was not definitive but was probably correct, is that there is no money allocated to it. That may be wrong, but no one has come back and said that yet. We certainly could put an Action item to ask staff to confirm that or not.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Alan. You took the words right out of my mouth. Gisella, if you could please take that down as an AI to confirm with staff whether there is any pot of money sitting around for outreach, for ALAC. Is there Any Other Business from anyone else? Alan, your hand is still up.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will put something in the chat, which we could add as another Action Item, if you'd like? That's specifically to look at the window and find out what the rules are.

BERAN GILLEN: Yes. I believe that should be an AI. Thank you Alan again. I don't have any more hands up.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: You have one. I would like to answer the question of Alan. There are no rules made, but the Meeting Strategy Working Group came out with a proposal to have all the meetings in the official days, because it's not that we can have ten days of meetings, but the goal was to [wishful 49:25] all the work during one year and to think how we can organize a six-day meeting, a four-day meeting, and a seven-day meeting, and that's the goal where we are going.

If we need to change something in how we organize those days, because we want to have a meeting after the closure of the Board Meeting, that's something we need to discuss now and push. But I don't think that we'll be able to get outside of the six, four and seven days. I can expand on that if you want more input on what the Working Group has said, but it's where we stand. I don't know who can be blamed, but it's the Working Group I was chairing.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Sébastian. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like confirmation therefore that it's a real rule, and that it's going to be honored? For instance, that there will be no Chairs Meeting on the Friday before? That the Board will not have Workshops the day before? That if the GAC chooses to meet, they won't be allowed to meet either? I just want to make sure that if we have rules, they're going to be applied uniformly. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: I believe that's fair enough, Alan, so we will keep that as an AI and get clarifications on that from the Meetings Team. Any more AOBs?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Yes. Sorry for that, I just want to add one point to Alan. Alan, just be careful, because when we will wish, if we wish, to organize an ATLAS III, IV, V, and we want to have one additional day, maybe we need to see how we want the rules applied. But I agree with you that we need to ask the question. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you Sébastian for that clarification. I believe we've reached the end of our meeting. No more hands up. No more AOBs. So I declare this meeting closed. Thank you everyone for joining. Thank you Alan and the rest of the team for coming through from the CCWG. Gisella,

thank you so much for being so patient with my connectivity issues. Thanks everyone, and see you in a couple of weeks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]