
YESIM NAZLAR:

So let's start the call recording. Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's ALAC Leadership Team Monthly Meeting taking place on 27th of January 2016 at 20:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Ron Sherwood, and Julie Hammer.

We have apologies from Olivier Crepin-LeBlond.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber; and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

Finally, I would like to remind everyone to please say your name while speaking for transcript purposes.

Over to you, Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the agenda and any other business to add? Seeing none, we will go right to the first item.

The first item is the policy development activities. I'm told that nothing's changed since yesterday, so we'll skip that item, unless anyone has any particular questions to raise. Seeing nothing, we will go on to item number four. This one we're going to have chaired by Leon Sanchez. This one may go quickly also. This is the update on the CCWG Accountability. Is there anybody who cares enough that it was not on

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.

the IANA Issues call earlier today? I honestly do not remember who was there.

Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I wasn't there. I do appreciate the updates. I don't want to take time since it is a packed call. But Leon has sent out and continues to send out some really useful information, and so I appreciate that. Yes, I'd like to be updated, but let's not take time now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, no. We do have time in the agenda, and there's one or two items that I want some feedback on from this group. I will look at that. Let me just pull up the page for the meeting this morning, so I have a [inaudible] of what I want to talk about.

There was a meeting yesterday. It ended early, in only two-and-a-half hours. I don't know if there's a cause and effect. It was perhaps the least productive meeting we've had in terms of results. There was certainly a lot of discussion and a lot of issues aired. It may lead to things getting better, hopefully.

There are couple of things that are worth reporting. The first one is the issue of human rights. We seem to be at [inaudible] at this point. The majority of those – at least the majority of those who are speaking – on the CCWG feel that the CCWG has given a lot of... Has shown a lot of flexibility and we are currently talking about a bylaw which says we care about human rights, we will do something about it in Work Stream 2,

and until we do that, it will not... This bylaw has no effect and specifically cannot be used for an IRP or in a court of law or something to hold something against us.

I'm paraphrasing, and I really don't want to get into the specific words. The Board, at this point, is sticking to their line that they do not want a bylaw. Some Board members have made comments like it is silly – I think that word was used, but I may be wrong – to have a bylaw which is not [operative], and yet there are loads of bylaws that have been put into the ICANN bylaws specifically under the term "transitional bylaws" that do not kick in until some external event happens.

So it's not unheard of, and those bylaws are still in the bylaws today, even though they kicked in twelve years ago. So it's not clear why there is a concern. At this point, the lawyers and the people who are most adamant about human rights have said the board identifies in their rationale why they had problems with what we presented. We have addressed each of those issues. And the board is now saying, "Yeah, but we're still not feeling comfortable about it."

So I think the ball is in the board's court to come back and identify what the hard reasons are that make them feel uncomfortable. I don't know how that one's going to play out.

Holly, is that a new hand?

HOLLY RAICHE:

No, sorry. I was just listening to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So that one is in play, unless Cheryl has something to add of either correct me or to add something that's happened since the meeting. I think that's where that one stands.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] at the moment. But I do know that a couple of board members are deeply concerned about not being able to control an external court to ICANN, [normal] IRP. So this is not within our own [inaudible], but that's around the garden outside. From assuming even if some time after such a bylaw is in the bylaw, that it could interpret [inaudible] but it is the intent therefore. And if that were to happen before the Work Stream 2 Framework of Interpretation, etc., were completed, that they would be absolutely open to all sorts of... They wouldn't be successful. But they would be [inaudible], but they would be costly and vexatious matters.

And that hasn't been helped by one of our members of CCWG, one of our recently joined – sorry, not member, participants – of CCWG publishing in one of the European fluffy [inaudible]. Civil society like to talk to each other [inaudible] gratifying piece about now ICANN can have its foot put to the fire, etc.

I [said] we do understand [Wolf's] concerns, and I suspect that we may end up with the final argument being it's not essential for transition. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. They had originally said the IRP in courts, but recently they have only said the IRP. They did not say courts.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've been talking to people—

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. I'm just pointing out that maybe they need to actually say the words. The lawyers I know asked for specific citations where someone has used this kind of thing. And I understand that the board may do that, may not have such citations, but there's still a concern.

But I think they need to provide some level of rationale other than, "Sorry, we just don't like it." If we're going to move forward. So clearly we have a strong impasse at this point and something has to give somewhere. Ultimately, the board has to approve, so...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What I'm hearing is that this could be a [deal breaker] from the board perspective. So we need to try and avoid a [deal breaker] if possible. And what I'm saying is it may be that we have to fall back on, look, [inaudible] support human rights being [inaudible] Work Stream 2, etc. [inaudible] transition essential, therefore it just goes in Work Stream 2 and we [inaudible] from now. I was suggesting that might be a way forward. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We need to counter the argument from certain people that quote “without the US government backstop, there is no guarantee.” And specifically, the NTIA has asked for a guarantee of an open Internet – i.e. freedom of speech. And this is the way that we can imply that we care about it.

I’m not making those statements. I’m simply saying somehow they need to be countered so that they can’t be made over and over again.

I see a whole bunch of hands up. We really don’t want to devote the whole hour-and-a-half to talking about human rights, but I will honor the hands. Tijani? Assuming the people will actually speak.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, very good. I agree 100% with Cheryl and I have exactly the same position as she has. I’d like to add two things. First of all, to counter, as

you said, Alan, the argument about when the transition happens there will not be any guarantee for human rights, etc., that our lawyers [countered] it. They said it very clearly that there will not be any problem or any change in the... They put it in the legal words and it is very clear. So this is one point.

Second point, I understood from the e-mail exchange between Bruce and Matthew that Bruce said that the last meeting of the board where they had those arguments, there was only a few members of the board. He said that he would bring back the result of this meeting to the board very soon, and they will have a meeting I think in Singapore very soon.

I understood from that, that perhaps this is a way to tell us that [inaudible] reconsider their position, and perhaps they will come up with either more [rationale] or perhaps be more flexible and perhaps accept this kind of bylaw that I myself find [useless], because if it is not [inaudible] to act before the Work Stream 2 is finished, what is the [inaudible] now? Why we didn't do the same for... I said that several times. Why we didn't do the—

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's not repeat the same arguments over again, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Rather than have an argument – sorry, discussion – about [inaudible]. I wouldn't minute seeing a report or something so that you can get a better flavor of what we as ALAC think and [inaudible] because I just find the summaries have got lots of problems with them, and at least my intellect says there's lots of problems with what's going on. I would like to better understand what the concerns are and if what's being proposed is [inaudible]. And I don't think this is the place—

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would suggest that we have already put our stake in the ground. We said we support the proposal. We had a concern about a time delay, time deadline, that was in the proposal and that's been addressed. And we had a minority group believe that we shouldn't have the bylaw at all until we actually have the Framework of Interpretation.

So we had a majority position we placed in our formal statement. There was a minority position that we talked about but did not put it in the statement because we decided not to put minority statements in there. And that's where it stands.

I have not heard anything since then that says our position has changed. There have been people who say the ALAC is against human rights. That does not correspond with what we wrote and what we formally said. I'm losing patience on going over this one again and again, to be quite honest.

The second one, which is a more substantial one, is there was one substantive issue that we raised which had not been discussed at all yet.

In short, there was a provision in the bylaw under core values which said “where feasible...” Sorry, what was the – feasible and advisable or practical or something. I don’t remember the words because my mind is going – we will rely on market mechanisms to ensure a healthy DNS marketplace.

The lead-in phrase was omitted under the theory that ICANN does not have the competence to make judgment calls on competition that national authorities do. Now, national authorities tend to look at things like antitrust – that level competition, not other levels. So the current proposal is saying ICANN will rely on market mechanisms, period.

The next statement in the core values says that we will do things to enhance the competition in the DNS marketplace. We are just starting a review program on competition. So clearly we have some opinions on it and we are allowed to talk about it. The first statement implies a prohibition.

Now, to confuse the issues, some people claim – the question was asked, “Well, how can we introduce new gTLDs and have a session on them and have a review on them, on competition, if we can’t [inaudible]?” Well, ICANN introducing new gTLDs since we are the custodian, we’re the ones that [inaudible] them out, that is a market mechanism. So ICANN doing that is a market mechanism and is therefore allowed. But other things were not allowed. If you go do a

Google on market mechanism, you will find a near infinite number of definitions.

To make it more interesting, the next phrase where they said, “We will be proactive in ensuring competition,” they have added... This is not something we’ve commented on before, because honestly, I never noticed it. They added saying, “As long as the things we do are developed by a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, policy development process.”

Now, the only place the term “policy development process” is used in the bylaws is with respect to the GNSO and ccNSO policy development processes. Those are very formal processes.

If you now look at things like the ICANN African strategy or the Latin American Caribbean strategy, there are very proactive things we are doing to build the market, to establish competition, to try to make sure there is a vibrant DNS market within those sectors.

They were developed through a bottom-up process, but certainly not a bottom-up policy development process in the definition of the bylaws.

So it almost sounds, by adding that expression, they are now saying that everything we’re doing in the African study, the new center that was open in Cairo I think, is not allowed anymore because we’re not supposed to be doing that.

So I think we have some real issues there, and they come right to the heart of issues that are near and dear to ALAC.

At this point, the discussion we had yesterday basically was me and Greg Shatan, who was agreeing with me, versus anyone else who was speaking.

I think we have what I could call... I'm hesitant to say it's a conflict of interest, but it's close, because the person leading this process is Becky Burr, who was, I believe, at the time, the original bylaws were written in the US Department of Commerce and had a hand in crafting it. She was the one who has led this process for the last year and is now essentially acting as the person presiding over the appeal. She is very determined to continue with what we have gone ahead with, and not a lot of other people are speaking up.

So at this point, I'm not sure we have a lot of chance of success. And the more I look at the words, the more I'm worried that this is a substantive issue that we should not be ignoring. So that's the issue I really would like to focus on today. And we've gone way over our 15 minutes, I suspect, already. But I welcome input on it.

And Cheryl, to the extent you feel comfortable talking about it, I would appreciate input from you as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] respond to the best of my ability. Look, basically, it's not hard-lining this because of her having run the IRP and other related processes during [process]. She's actually hard-lining with [inaudible] from the constituency group that she belongs to and people like [Donna Austin] are leading, etc.

It's much more like the [ALAC] having a view and the industry having a view [inaudible] individual. That said, let's see if we can get some mutually agreeable outcomes by encouraging greater understanding.

I think one of the most powerful parts of what you just said in terms of arguments is to work on the removal of the term "policy development process" and have that replaced in the follow-on into the text which we've spent most of our time on today's call focusing on it, which is the "where practical and possible," whatever it is. Whatever that language is.

But move to those examples you gave with the Latin strategy and African strategy to show that these [inaudible] bottom-up processes not clearly definable as policy development, but bottom-up strategies. And surely we should be able to have ICANN continue these during [inaudible]. And therefore pull the language in the follow-on paragraph back to something that says bottom-up processes, full stop, or something along those lines. That at least I think is saving us a "gotcha" from later on.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I think you're correct. I think for the new one I just discovered today, it's easy to fix by removing policy development processes, leaving bottom-up, which neither of them was there before. But adding bottom-up multi-stakeholder, but leaving out policy development process, that one I think is okay. That one can be fixed that way.

Now, it wasn't commented on by anyone in the formal comment period, but I think it is a substantive issue that we shouldn't ignore at

this point. It does not address the original one that we were discussing until this morning, where feasible and practical, whatever the expression is.

It then relies on, yes, we can do it if we're part of a formal market mechanism, but we can't do it if we're not supposed to be part of that particular market mechanism. And since none of this is defined, we're back into the weeds of trying to take a term that's been in the bylaws forever and now we need a formal definition of it really quick so we understand what it means. I don't think that's practical in the timeframe we have.

All right, any other comments? Holly's hand is up. I don't know if it's a new or old one.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, new.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, then.

HOLLY RAICHE: Very quickly. I just trust something that says market mechanisms are fantastic without... [inaudible] mechanisms where possible. So that's [a bold] statement with no further definition really troubles me.

If you look at the interactions [inaudible] new gTLDs, they didn't have the sort of safeguards that we wanted, so we were doing kind of let's [inaudible] and get criticized for it.

So I have some reservations about just a bold statements that says market mechanisms are fantastic, particularly when we haven't defined them. So we can't [solve] it here, but I don't like that bold kind of support for something that is not defined, and that just by itself can cause havoc. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think it causes even more havoc when some of the market mechanisms are ones which [intricately] include ICANN and were allowed to play in that game, but other market mechanisms are the ones that we're supposed to be staying out of.

Okay, I don't have anything more to say on it. I'm just waving a flag. It seems to be an issue that is... Yes, go ahead, whoever is saying, "Alan."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

What you're articulating is exactly the reason why those that want the language the way it is want the language the way it is. They don't want ICANN involved in market mechanisms, in anything that they are not involved in [inaudible] market mechanism. So [inaudible] arguing some of [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Can you write that down? I want to see that one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's recorded. You can grab it. Because it is pretty much the same reasoning, at least by my understanding. The other thing I guess is that we might have is we can point to [inaudible] point one to some extent. These are not final bylaw languages. These are arguably exemplars of the type of language and intent that the community is looking for, the bylaw drafters, to then create.

So there may be opportunity still for language that is more suitable from our perspective to come into play during that [silo] process. But what's essential is that the community's intent for the bylaws that are being yet to draft is clear and unambiguous. If it's not clear and unambiguous, even if there is minority views clearly articulated, then we will have an issue where the drafters are going to be needing to make value judgments and they could very well make the wrong ones.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do recall that on these article one changes, in the first proposal, for some of them, there was a rationale in the first proposal. Since then, it has disappeared. So all we have in the text is the old bylaw and the new one recommended. And when the differences are explicitly deleting what we consider a critical phase, I don't think the drafters are going to have the leverage to put it back in again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, then you've got the answer to your own question. We need the rationale. If we have to take the [inaudible] view, the rationale is

important so the drafters understand and we don't have one schedule arguing against [inaudible] next schedule.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Unfortunately, the lawyers have told us that if we're using words in multiple ways and assume that they will be able to finesse the definitions, good luck. Anyway, okay, I think we've spent enough time on this one. I have nothing else to add on the overall issue on accountability. Someone has made the statement – I think it may have been Thomas yesterday, but I'm not sure – if we're going to approve by Marrakech or the end of Marrakech, we must have a report published by middle February. That leaves us two weeks and I'm not sure how we're going to do that. Especially since at this point we don't have any meetings scheduled after tomorrow. But I presume there will be meetings scheduled.

All right. Next one is FBSC and fiscal year reports. This is the first time that we are going to have an opportunity to actually look at the specifics of the requests. There is an FBSC meeting on Friday which will be looking at them in more depth, but I think I want the opportunity for this group to look at them and wave any red flags if there are anything there that's going to be problematic or that we want refinement. And of course... Is there anything we've left off? Because it's going to be really too late in a few days.

Heidi, I'll turn it over to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you, everyone. Please do take a look at the workspace I've put into the chat. We've done a new format. We've developed a new format that allows for easier view of the various requests.

As mentioned on the ALAC call, we have a total of 19 requests. We have six from the ALAC and 13 from the various regions. Alan, do you want me to start with the ALAC requests?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so here we go. The ALAC was reviewed basically already, so these are just quick updates. I'll just go through them.

The first is for a strategic session on the Saturday at meetings 57 and 58. Again, that day is not going to be anything new. It's what we're asking for is basically funds for an external facilitator and some warm meals for you. So basically that is that. That also includes a liaison, that includes I believe, yes, both current and incoming ALAC members, RALO leaders, and liaisons for that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I guess I'll comment on each one as we go on, one by one. I don't understand the impact of saying who's going to be there unless we're counting how many lunches we want.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I find the fact that the GNSO has been getting hot lunches on Saturdays and Sunday forever and we never do, and we're now putting in a special request, that we have to put an image of a strategic session on so we get fed, I think that is shameful, to be quite honest, on that part of it.

On the facilitator, I support it if we have something that's going to merit having a facilitator for. I'm not 100% sure we have anything in mind even at this point. I'd like a little bit of input on this session. Remember, when we originally started with a strategy session, it was because we wanted to meet on Saturday. We were not being allowed to meet on Saturday because we were told we had to start on Sunday, and to add a day we had to give it a title, so we called it a strategy session. Let's put the history in the right order.

Comments? Is this something we want to stake our reputation on, essentially? Nobody cares? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I care. I care. I think it's worth [inaudible]. I think if you put it in and you don't use whatever extenuating circumstances, then you can rationalize [inaudible]. But I think these sorts of events and exercises are very valuable team builders, and I think you should [inaudible].

I understand your annoyance about [inaudible] organization versus another, but that does [inaudible] for a whole lot of reasons and we

could talk about those [inaudible]. It is what it is and I think [we] should do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: But of course we can cancel a facilitator, but keep the lunch later on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, any other comments?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can I raise my hand, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: The strategy session we had was [inaudible] I understood to be the first half of what should've been a longer discussion, which was that kind of look at how do we organize ourselves in terms of working groups, policy stuff, how many working groups do we have. That kind of discussion I thought was going to take place didn't take place, doesn't require a facilitator, and that would be really useful and the lunch would be so nice.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Now you're saying what should we put on the agenda for Saturday for the meeting that will be held next October? I don't even remember where it is, or do we have a place for it?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Puerto Rico.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Puerto Rico. That's not really a discussion I want to have right now. A lot is going to change between now and then.

[HEIDI ULLRICH]: True. We don't need a facilitator, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a quick point as a reference. This request is for both 57 and 58, so it's Meeting C and Meeting A.

Next request is for an ALAC development session. That is basically a second request for the pilot that we held last year in Dublin. Again, it adds the external facilitator and a lunch I believe for that, too.

The aim of submitting this is that if this is requested, normally that if requests are approved two times consecutively, that they often go into the core budget. So that is another aim for submitting this one this year, on top of the success of that development session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, on this one, you were talking about another parallel session for the RALO leaders. Is that going to be [inaudible] as we go ahead? I don't want to talk about it now. I just want to affirm that, yes, it's there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. But it's not parallel. I'll speak about it later.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I will point out to everyone that the C meeting is a seven-day meeting. It starts on Saturday and goes through until Friday. In Dublin, we added a day for the development session. It is not clear to me whether we will be, number one, allowed to add a day or not because there is this dogma that some people have said exists that says we're not allowed to expand on the week.

Now, the chair of the group that created the dogma says that's not what they meant, but nevertheless that has been cited.

Then there's the issue of do we want to meet for an eighth day? If we do extend it, the general feeling from most people who have weighed in at this point is, yes, we do.

So the question is are we requesting to repurpose the seventh day – that is, take the day away from the meeting and repurpose it for a professional development or a touchy-feely, let’s all get to know each other day, or are we asking for an extra day? I’d like to open the floor for that one.

Nobody? Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I really was asking for volunteers for comment.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I know you were, but nonetheless, my recollection is that we did discuss this earlier and the idea – some discussed the Friday, some discussed the Saturday – and the idea that we agreed to, or you agreed to, is the hybrid approach. Having it in the afternoon.

So this meeting, as it is, is timed for 12:00 to 18:00. It’s like the afternoon session. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record, I did not agree to that. Does anyone else here care? I would’ve thought this would be a really interesting discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we care. I thought it's a good idea that we discussed it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which was the good idea?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The hybrid, the afternoon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. And Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I think that since we are asking for a development session we should ask for an extra day for it, an extra half a day, [inaudible].

The request, if it is only to have, I don't know, an external facilitator, I don't think it deserves to be a request for a budget. For me, when we decide on Meeting A, B, C, an [inaudible] was seven days needed for the community. It is not seven days as an extra, to have more [inaudible]. No. The community needed this seven days. So make use of the seven days as an ICANN meeting and have the development session [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. That was exactly my understanding, that the seven days are going to be scheduled as the formal ICANN meeting with 2000

people or whatever. We have little control over what's going to be scheduled on Friday at this point and we may end up with public sessions scheduled on Friday. I would really not want to see us take the whole Friday out of our agenda to devote it to what I think is an important process, but not one that we should subtract from the week.

So my feeling is that we should request the extra day. Anybody else? Heidi wants to speak. Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

As I noted in the chat, the Meeting Strategy Working Party did [note] that Friday, the last day of Meeting C, would be a development day. I do know that the sense that no meetings should be held beyond the scheduled days is really aimed to be the rules.

I'm aware of what happened at Marrakech, that we do have a CCWG on Friday, but again, I'm trying to help you get as much as you can and my sense is that this request will be challenged if an extra day is scheduled.

In addition, because – the reasoning behind having it between 12:00 and 18:00 is that there would still be time for an ALAC meeting or an ALT meeting, etc., on the Friday morning. So you would have a half day, basically, for discussions and then into that development session, which would allow people who want to get back to their families and to work on Monday to still get back there in time, etc. That might also need to be kept in mind. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you, Heidi. I bristle, I must admit, when I'm told that essentially staff decisions are going to be pushing back at us heavily when Fadi and everyone else keeps on telling us we're the bosses, we're the ones who are supposed to be setting the guidelines. Tijani? Can't hear you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I would like to [inaudible] repeat... Do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you, yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I will repeat, and I know you don't want me to repeat, but I will repeat. The Meeting Strategy Work Party [inaudible] divided. They proposed to ALAC and ALAC will decide.

Second point, they give perhaps their ideas. They cannot decide all the content, give us a shape more or less. Their main mission essentially for Meeting B.

I don't think it is rational to say it is the working party [inaudible]. They proposed that, but I don't think it is binding for us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Heidi, a question. When you said the meeting strategy something... And it drifted off into Never Never Land. Did you mean

Sebastien's Meeting Strategy Group or our Meeting Strategy Working Party?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The latter, ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then you're creating a self-fulfilling prophecy because they were told at an early process that under no conditions would we ever be allowed to have an extra day, and therefore if there's going to be a development day, it had to be on the Friday. So they're just echoing back what was said to them.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. That's a valid point, but again, you will recall that I gave other reasons. [inaudible] still exist.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. That doesn't mean we shouldn't ask. Now, it's an interesting issue and I know we're going to have some pushback from people who believe that we shouldn't do it. My inclination would be to say that we do it... If we're going to do it for a half day, then we do it on Saturday morning from 9:00 AM to 2:00 PM and then people can leave at that point. There are many place in the world that's as good as leaving the day before.

My inclination is to say this is an extra day, and if only because, as Heidi pointed out, you get it twice and it's permanent. Last time we asked for an extra day. So there's some merit in doing it for that reason also.

Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

That's something that you might wish to raise with Rob on the FBSC call as to what he's seen or what he's hearing that the other ACs and SOs who normally request development sessions, what they will be holding their sessions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. To some extent, I'm not sure it counts. If you look at the GNSO, which is the only one I know that's done it on a regular basis, they've decided to ignore the New Meeting Strategy to a large extent. So they do their work on a seven-day week and they're still going to do it... On a six-day week, rather. And they're still going to do it on a six-day week. So the Friday is an extra day from their perspective. Their approaching it from a different perspective than we are, I think.

Anyway, let's go on to the next one. It should be an interesting discussion when we come to the real discussion.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. Alan, just on that one, do you wish to change that to Saturday or do want to keep the hybrid for the time being?

ALAN GREENBERG: My inclination is to change the Saturday and we may revert it back.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so I'm going to change it to Saturday. Okay. Next one is the...

ALAN GREENBERG: If nothing else, it gives us a battle. We don't have enough battles in ICANN.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just keep in mind we have 19 requests, and there's a bucket. Anyway, okay. Next one is a captioning. It's the second request for a captioning project. Basically, the only addition to this is that the captioning would also be in French and Spanish. It's pretty much the same. Again, the aim is to get that in as a second, so it will go into core eventually. Any questions on that one?

ALAN GREENBERG: I see no hands.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Next one is a support for working group chairs to attend ICANN meetings. This particular request starts broadly, but then it quickly goes basically that they are requesting for Dev to go to all of the three public meetings in Fiscal Year 17, and if possible to be sponsored to attend the

three meetings in Fiscal Year 16. Would you like me to say some comments on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I haven't read this and it's a whole page long on my screen. Does it say this is for Dev?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It does, yes. Maureen, if you want to say some words on this, but it's basically... It is for Dev.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So this is for the Outreach and Engagement chair?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, he's also chair of the TPS. He's also chair of the Social Media Group. He's also... Let's see. I think that's it at the time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So this is, in theory, a request for very dedicated volunteers who are not otherwise funded to go to ICANN meetings. For dedicated and productive.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think the answer to that question Alan is yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: So the question is are we likely to be successful in this? Is this something we want to go on record as requesting in this way? And probably some other questions. Anyone have any thoughts? Go ahead, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Yeah. As has been stated, [inaudible] from saying talking about this. But we wanted to make it more generic. We didn't want to make it more generic, although we couldn't help but put Dev down as an example of, as you say, someone who works really, really hard over and beyond what a lot of other people do. He would be [inaudible] working group meetings. He'd be attempting to [inaudible] together remotely. We just felt that this was... There could be other ways in which we could actually manage this for him. When you put so much time and energy into not just his own working groups, but he's also called in as a consultant to other working groups as well.

Although the application is generic, there is a very specific call here on his behalf. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I have some comments, but I'm going to reserve them until I hear other people. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I do appreciate to have Dev funded. I am really sad that he's not because he's one of the At-Large people who was the most [inaudible] while a lot of people asking a lot and doing nothing for the community. So I would like it to be accepted. I'm really

[inaudible]. But I have real doubt that you will succeed because you will open the door for all working groups in all ICANN. I don't think that the board or the finance department will accept to do it for At-Large and not for the others. I would like to have other things for that. I would like him to be, for example, on the next [inaudible] on the ALAC, so that he will be always funded. If we can succeed, I really want it [inaudible]. But I have the fear that we will not succeed. This is [not] my problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: He can be the next NARALO member of ALAC. All right, no one sees the humor in that. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I did see the humor in that. Cheryl was biting her tongue saying that is the perfect result. That would probably be the best way of doing it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unfortunately, your committee asks for a delay in [inaudible] new geographic region rule.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] ask for a delay at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would like to see a situation where perhaps on a planned rotating strategy where working groups that are at a particular point in their processes and in their timeline or at a particularly critical piece of work, and that were highly active and demonstrably so could [inaudible] the working group chairs travel to ICANN meetings. No doubt about it. I'd like it to be planned. I'd like it to be organized. I'd like it to happen.

I would like [inaudible] references to Dev from this document.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. Two points. First one is that in its current state that is strictly travel support to an ICANN meeting, I highly doubt that this will be approved because one of the principles is that request should not include travel support.

The second point is that, keep in mind, Sandra is going to hopefully be submitting a request for a new ICANN Academy course for chair skill development. Within that budget, within that request, currently there is a budget for three additional – three travel slots – on a contingency basis.

So if Dev or any one of our chairs, there might be funding involved in that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Cheryl, is that a new hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is. I'm typing, but I'll say it. This [inaudible] in my opinion, based on the fact that it's a request for travel support for travel support's sake. But, the fact that it will fail, I like the way that Heidi's thinking, that's not a problem. It's just a delay, not a failure.

However, if we leave the name of anyone, but in particular, I'm going to say Dev at the moment, [inaudible] document cause significant other particular harm at the regional level and say assuming [inaudible] this space, we have to have that name removed. It's just too [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let me weigh in on this. Clearly, we cannot make a request that asks to fund a particular person. That goes without saying. I do not believe we should be asking to fund the Outreach and Engagement chair or anything like that.

I think it is quite reasonable given the following. We have currently 27 slots. We are not allowed to use two of them because two of the people are... Two of the slots were nominally for liaisons and we do not need them for liaisons.

Now, if you look to travel slots for other groups, they have been given a [inaudible] number of travel slots and told that you can use them any way you want. We are told you can use 25 of your 27 any way you want, but the other two can only be used in certain ways.

We effectively have been singled out and told that those two slots are very carefully controlled and somebody, some unnamed person – we don't know who it is – has discretion over it.

Since we have been told that... And by the way, we had a case this year where we tried to use those slots, as most of you know, and we were refused and told, "No, you can't."

I would suggest that since the travel people and the travel support people have stonewalled us... The GNSO has put in special requests for travel in the past. They have another 20 slots or so which they use to bring in their stakeholder and working group chairs and various other people. That is now, I believe, a continuing issue, a continuing funding thing. It was a pilot for a while. I'm not sure if it's still technically a pilot or not. We have not been given that [inaudible].

Yes, we have had general assemblies and stuff, but we haven't been allowed to bring people to ICANN to do work. Since we have failed miraculously or spectacularly on trying to get those extra two slots that we already have in a budget deployed the way we believe it's useful, I believe we should put in a special funding request for travel to ICANN meetings. It may be doomed, but given that we have not been able to use other mechanisms where the slots were already funded to use them, then we're going to do a special travel request. And every meeting, we will decide how we use those funds on a case by case basis for someone who is doing a lot of work and where the At-Large can benefit from them being available at the meeting.

So I would suggest we transform that into a different form that says we need some extra travel slots for some flexibility. We have been given no flexibility, even on slots that are funded, so here it is. You want to reject it, then maybe you want to go talk to the people who already have the budget and allow us some flexibility in using it.

I see some tick marks. Any objections?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right, next one, Heidi. We're running awful late, so let's try to... I'll work with you tomorrow on this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. You'll [inaudible]. Anyone send it back to Maureen and her group can work on it. She has a small committee it looks like that's working on that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: If Maureen wants to do it under the specifications I just said, go for it. I'm not looking for extra work.

HEIDI ULLRICH: She's saying that she's happy to withdraw this current request and write another one. I think, Maureen, you could basically just tweak this one a little bit.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it's more than tweaking, because it's got to be in reference to the travel slots we can't use.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: If you want to do a first draft, I'll be happy to look at it sometime before the Friday deadline that we have to formally publish this.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Maureen. Appreciate it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Next one is for access by RALOs for funding of local engagement activities. Basically, they are asking for up to \$2000 each for targeted local discretionary funds to permit local travel, luncheons, displays, graphic promotional, Facebook, Twitter graphics and printing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sounds completely rational and reasonable to me.

HEIDI ULLRICH: May I offer my comments?

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course you may, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. In the current state, I don't know if this is going to be approved. I think what the result might be is that they suggest that the RALOs and ALSes work more closely with the GSE team. In terms of printing, etc., again there is a significant bucket in the communications department for such printing, etc. We just need to know before – significantly before – you need it what printing, etc., you need.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Two things. I would suggest that we do delete the printing part from that, but I have a question. When you say they have a fund for printing, that is they will print things to someone and mail them or they will pay to have something printed locally.

HEIDI ULLRICH: They will pay to print them. Usually they have good vendors here [inaudible] FedEx them to wherever they need to go.

ALAN GREENBERG: You do realize it will cost more to FedEx a box of paper halfway around the world than to print it locally.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think that they have really good contracts here. That's what I'm hearing.

ALAN GREENBERG: In any case, I don't want to fight the printing one. We can fight that one separately. I would support this recommendation [inaudible] deleting the printing. And if they want to come back and say [we] work closely with GSE, then I want to see a GSE program that says we will provide funding for this. This can't be contingent on GSE deciding to send a person to this event. Again, we're going to spend \$3000 to save \$100?

I'm happy to have it rejected and have them say work more closely with GSE, but I want something coming out of it saying how we're going to make that happen.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, move on, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, unless someone else has a comment. I see a tick mark, but I don't know if that's old or new. In any case, tick marks are always appreciated.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, next one is fixing the bugs in ICANN's machine translation tools used for the LACRALO mailing list. This is coming actually from the Technology Taskforce. Basically, it's just a request to focus on this and have ICANN dedicate the resources necessary to finally complete this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I wouldn't be surprised if it needs some rewording. I haven't read it yet. I support this wholeheartedly. Anyone object to it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] amusement [I get] reading the gibberish.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. So you're saying it probably does need to be reworded?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I mean that—

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, the gibberish in the translation. Come on, it's not nearly as good ever since the head of cattle was eliminated.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Does everyone know the head of cattle story? In English, when you reply to message, it says – your e-mailer probably puts an RE: in front of it. In Portuguese, it puts RES. When the automatic translation translated a subject with a reply from Vanda, it translated RES as if it was a Spanish word, and it is a Spanish word for – I don't remember exactly, but cow or something, and it translates to head of cattle. So we'd end up with subject lines with the prefix "head of cattle."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fabulous?

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I see no objections going ahead [of] this one. I think it is a crime that this has been allowed to continue for eight or nine years and no one has been able to fix the problem. So yes, I think this is a budget request. And if someone says we shouldn't need a budget request to fix it, we'll say, "Fine, then you arrange to fix it some other way." I don't want to wait for the next budget year to fix it, but if this is how we get someone to focus on it, I go for it.

Next?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay, those are all the ALAC ones. Now we're onto the RALO ones. I'm going to go a little bit faster. There are quite a few.

The first one is a cross-RALO request for a RALO leader development session at ICANN 52. This actually was presented to the RALO Secretariat Meeting and they supported this. This is similar to the ALAC development request, but it would be on the Friday 8:00 or 9:00 to 12:00.

So the idea behind it would be if the ALAC was on the Friday in the afternoon, the same facilitator would go from the RALOs in the morning, and then move over to the ALAC development session in the afternoon. Thus, saving cost, etc.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And going on official public record that after noon or whatever it is, these people are on vacation for the last part of their ICANN paid vacation.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

No. Then the idea would be that they would be able to regroup and perhaps discuss ways to implement action items coming out of that session. [inaudible] thinking on your feet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani? Very good, Heidi. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I'd like to ask why we don't include the RALO leadership inside our development session, and then we will have only one request [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give you my answer to it. My answer is we're looking at different scales for the development session and we're looking at a different dynamic. For the ALAC, we really want people who are going to feel comfortable with working with each other. It's a small group. It's 15 people. If we add 10 people to this group, some of whom are going to be very new to this environment overall, some of whom have a different life view I think, I think it's going to dilute both efforts. And I would not recommend that. And Cheryl, I don't know if your tick was for Tijani or for me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. May I move on?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so. In light of how we might be changing the ALAC development day, I'm not quite sure where this one fits. So you and I are going to have to do some talking tomorrow. They may have to be presented in tandem and they're going to have to be synchronized with each other.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Obviously there's going to be flexibility I'm sure from the people who are looking at these and they might come back to you with some suggestions.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like that there's some interaction.

HEIDI ULLRICH: There is, actually. That's why Rob and people from the finance team will be on the call on Friday. They have seen copies of these, but I'll alert them to any changes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Next we have AFRALO. Tijani, do you want to quickly go over them or should I review them? I'll be very brief.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, why don't you do it? You've been doing the rest of them.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. The first one is the AFRALO General Assembly request. That is basically the same as the last time. I don't think there's anything more to add to that. I think that one has a very strong chance of being approved.

The next one is for an AFRALO workshop at the 2016 IGF on Privacy and User Data Management. Again, in the past, they've been approved. This last year, the AFRALO request was not approved because there as a technical glitch in the submission process for their panel, so it never was approved. But I think this one stands a decent chance.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now, Heidi, at one point you said there was a strong tendency to not fund these IGF workshop sessions anymore.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, this one I doubt will get the full request. They [asked] for five people. I doubt that they'll get that. In the past, any kind of outreach activities were not funded, but the panels have been.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So the comment you made last year is no longer operative. We're [inaudible] workshop.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm going by the evidence. Last year, again, even after they told us that, they approved the APRALO one and they would've approved the AFRALO one if it had gone through.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Any comments on that? Move on? Okay. The one after that is the first forum on DNS in Chad basically looking at an event, a conference, on security issues in Chad and total amount being requested is \$13,000.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Then the final one is—

ALAN GREENBERG: Are we going to be translating that into English or is this a demonstration that ICANN is multilingual?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm assuming that they... Well, I know that [Xavier] speaks French, and basically even I can read this, so it's pretty basic French.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have the Finance & Budget Committee, though, that is supposed to be going through these. We do need translation for Finance & Budget. It's a short thing. We have people who can translate.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Well, Tijani can translate or Gisella.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: We have a [chance] to have [inaudible] who is the French speaker, and on the Finance Committee who have Cherine who is [inaudible] French speaker. So I don't think we need to translate it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, we have our Finance & Budget Committee, which is supposed to be ratifying these and reviewing them. We could do a Google translate if you'd like, but I suspect having a person do it, we'll end up with something that may get you funded. Google Translate may not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Could you translate just that part, the description? Could you do that in English, so we could just add that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I [inaudible]. If it is not too long, I will do it. If it is too long, I cannot.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You can see it on the workspace. Otherwise, we can have—

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, you have several French speakers on staff.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, okay. Gisella is going to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you can find one of them who will spend five minutes and do it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Gisella has volunteered. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Otherwise, I'll do it. And you will not like the result.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, moving on. The next one comes from an ALS as well. This one is [training] of trainers on a resilient Internet with [what DNS for DRC]. Basically, it's one coming from the Democratic Republic of Congo and it is for a number of conferences, workshops. The first one is a six-day workshop – four days. Sorry, it's a total of six days divided into two parts.

Then the second phase will take place in the 26 provinces of the DRC. That includes 26 various workshops on that.

The total amount being requested is \$100,400. Again, rough estimate.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would find this a really difficult one to justify in terms of the overall package. How much money is available for all ACs and SOs?

HEIDI ULLRICH: A little over \$600,000.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So asking for 15% of the total budget for something which is somewhat connected with ICANN, but not really, I think is going to be a

hard sell. Can someone explain the title to me? Anybody? Tijani, Heidi?
A resilient Internet with what DNS? I don't know what that means.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think I could relatively quickly improve that, but basically I would say that resilient Internet for DRC.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that. I just don't understand the title. Heidi, what is your...
Do you think this has any chance at all of being funded? Tijani next after Heidi.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I [confer with] the expectation of Heidi. It is I think an automatic translation, machine translation. That's why it is in this shape. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I hope the rest of the text is not machine translated.
Nevertheless, Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, two comments on this one. I don't think this one stands a very good chance. It is too expensive for what the target group is going to be.
A lot of this could be done virtually. There could be a webinar. There could be an ICANNLearn course that is developed for this.

There might be a chance that they work with the GSE team and have one conference in that country. Those are my thoughts.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, where did this originate? How did it come about? Tijani, are you with this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Pardon me, but can you repeat your question please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you know how this came about? Where did the request come from?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It comes from [Boudoin Chambly] [inaudible]. It's an ALS in DRC [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: It's essentially a request from one ALS.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: One ALS, yes. It is written. It is from [inaudible]. It is an ALS from DRC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's pass this on to the FBSC, but my honest recommendation to the FBSC I think is to say that this is not something that we believe we can

fund. This amount of money for something that is targeted at one ALS I think is just not within the scope of what we should be doing. But let's keep it and we'll pass it on, but let's make sure any grammar mistakes are corrected first.

Let's go ahead. We're going to run out of time if we're not careful.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. This is APRALO. There are five. I'll be very quick. The first one is a visit to China by a number of members of the APRALO leadership team, plus regional partners if available. That comes from the APRALO leadership team. This is basically asking for a request for travel to visit Beijing to speak about the potential new ALS from [ISE] to meet with the head of China from ICANN staff as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thoughts on this one? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah, I've got some thoughts. I think it's an idea if and when we were already in the region, as in in China at an ICANN meeting or at an industry meeting or at a NIC meeting would be more likely to succeed. It is a fact in our region that there are times when a meet and greet is an expected formal part of an ongoing process [inaudible] relationship. This is a very good example of one of those. Let's put it in, but I'm sadly not very hopeful for it. But I do understand the concept. I support the concept. I would like to have seen it matched with a time that we are already there [inaudible] extra.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or a lot closer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly. But we're talking China is the main country, but [inaudible] Malaysia, to some extent Thailand, [inaudible] typically meet and greet [inaudible] take things to the next level.

ALAN GREENBERG: What I'm saying is the five people are a \$200 flight away, then it's a different issue than bringing them from halfway around the world.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly. Even if we were in a Singapore meeting, we can hop to China. Yeah, that's the problem. It's a logistics disappointment I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have an estimated cost on that one?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: You should be able to do that based on our current conference costing, can't you?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen, I didn't see any costing in there. Did you add that?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'm just trying to find it myself, actually. At the end of the [report], we did put some costings in there. And that was [inaudible]. There were some who were actually quite close and they weren't very expensive. It was just covering [inaudible]. But we were actually also looking at getting some sponsorship from within China. It's a very... There's been lots of discussions with [inaudible] about how we can actually make [inaudible].

I know we haven't actually [inaudible] them formally, but this is in preparation for the following year. And assuming that we will accept them. It's just such an unusual organization and there are ways and means of which we just want to make it an effective relationship between [ISE] and ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: They have a lot more money than we do. Maybe they should invite a few of us, a few of the appropriate people to visit and fund them.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We're looking at [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let's keep it for the moment. I'm not real eager about that. Heidi, you have your hand up. The floor is yours regardless of which item you're going onto, but we are almost at the hour and a half and we have several agenda items to talk about.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. My thoughts on that one are it probably will not be approved, but the results might be basically what Cheryl said is that there will be something either at an ICANN meeting or another regional meeting in the APAC region. So might as well submit it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, next one is APRALO leadership team outreach at the 11th IGF. So similar. I would suggest continue with that one. Shall I move on?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Next one is a local showcase at the APRALO activity at AFNIC 42 to be held in Dacca, Bangladesh. The idea is just a showcase at the ALS ISOC [inaudible] in that region.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We do need numbers for all of these. I don't want to talk about it now, but we will need numbers to submit these. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think, Alan, no you don't really need them. A lot of times, if approved, as they start reviewing, going through the review process internally, we get those figures. We don't need that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, fine.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Should I move on?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Next one is ICANN workshops to support the first Palestinian National IGF. It is simply that. It's an information capacity building session about ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we normally funded things for regional IGFs?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. Don't quote me, but GSE's team might be able to.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what I would've thought.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Let's put that through and hope that they route it somewhere else. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Next one is a support for the first Indian school on Internet governance. Basically, like a summer school and the [inaudible] summer school. It is looking at a summer school in India. I think they would be... They are looking for sponsorship as well, additional sponsorship.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, do we have a history of funding any of the other summer schools?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sandra?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't believe we have, but...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sandra, I think you have experience with that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: But not through fiscal request, as far as [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. I mean through an ALAC request, budget request.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] can you hear me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, yeah. Can I say that this kind of activity is generally supported by the GSE? So the Department of [Sally]. For example... Yeah. So we may make the request and the response will be it will be funded by – it can be done with this department and do it with this special request.

But I think it is a very good thing that the first IGF in Palestine [inaudible] in Palestine. It is very hard conditions that people cannot do anything there, so it will be good thing if we can fund it, but I doubt we will manage to have the funding for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sandra, were you going to speak?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. As for funding the summer school, I can just say that ICANN is directly funding summer schools and supporting not only the European one but also, as far as I know, the Middle East and other summer

schools, so ICANN is already engaged in that. I see no point to put this through a RALO request, to be honest.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and I presume it's through GSE that's funding it or is it some other part of ICANN?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Oh, I don't know that. It could be even on the regional [inaudible] is GSE, then, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: But honestly, I see no point. This is none of the business of a RALO to request funding for summer school, which is organized by third parties. Then [inaudible] could have gone through the RALO budget to ask ICANN to fund the summer school in [Meissen] and we never did it as it wouldn't make sense. They can ask ICANN directly not even for funds but also for support in terms of lectures, referenda. Yeah, lectures and faculty and fellows and so on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. That comment is going to be relevant for the next one, also. Heidi, is it possible to extract the ones that we've just identified? The summer school and the regional IGF, and quickly talk to the GSE

people and say, “Is this something that we should be routing directly to you and not be doing funding requests on?”

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I can do that. But again, the – yeah, I’ll do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I’m not saying take them out of this list for the Finance & Budget Committee.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, I understand.

ALAN GREENBERG: I’m saying in parallel, hopefully, perhaps, with some preliminary answers by Friday, is this kind of thing they may be amenable to? But I agree with the previous speakers.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. What about the one from AFRALO, the DRC. That one, as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: You can certainly mention that one, as well. I don’t think it falls into the same package. It’s not the same type of event. I mean, IGF and summer school stuff are more generic things than something aimed at people in one city. So I think they’re somewhat different. You can certainly mention them at the same time.

I would tend to put the next one from EURALO in the same category.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well this one... This one is a request for five EURALO members to attend this ICANN [inaudible]. So in the past, what's happened is that they've used all of their five CROPP slots for the regional IGF, and every time they put the request for the [inaudible], it's not approved. So the history is not good, and in addition, again, this is basically travel support to a third party. So the possibility of this getting approved is, in my view, not high.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I participated in the discussion in the EURALO meeting, and Olivier said that they've never funded it before, but we're going to ask again, so there...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So go ahead?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Next one is the NARALO General Assembly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let's go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is a very strong request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, move on.

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't need to approve the concept. It's already accepted. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Then the other last one is a request from Alfredo Calderon with Glenn McKnight, as well. This is a request for a creation of augmented reality, multimedia resources. So this basically is a request where Alfredo would be managing several undergraduate students to turn a lot of At-Large as well as ICANN material into augmented reality types of video clips, enhanced comic strips, etc.

The request is for a total of, I believe, of around \$6,000... 1,000 of which would be paid to Alfredo for the management, and then the other funding would be for the payment to the undergraduate, the university students.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Do you have any comments on it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I do. Among the principals for the Fiscal Year '16 request was that no community member from the same community that the request was funded can be paid for the implementation of a project. So the problem here is – go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're saying this might be funded but not the \$1,000 for the remuneration.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, that is one problem. The other problem is that this falls very close to that... It would fall into that bucket of communications where they would say, "Okay. We will help you develop these kinds of augmented reality types of films, etc." So the result might be yes, but let communications lead on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem if that's the answer, if it actually happens. But if you look at the other one that we're looking at on e-books, we're three-quarters of the way into the year and we're starting to have the discussions on it. If we're saying ICANN will lead on things, internal ICANN department, they actually have to do it. And there's no evidence that they're geared up to do that.

But I'm happy to have them tell us that and this time we'll be geared up with the proper answer quickly. Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yeah, just again, a general comment with just request here. It's the first time that I'm involved in all the details behind this being on the [inaudible]. I must say I have the, again, general problem that requests are being made for single ALS activities. In other words, [inaudible] never use the RALO structure to ask for any funds from ICANN when [inaudible] for the ALS I work for. [inaudible] for, did ask for funds and we did ask ICANN directly.

And there was sometimes a good chance to get funded. I do agree that we can fund or we can put in requests, which are for the good of [inaudible] RALO. So for instance, travel request and therefore we put it in travel request for ICANN [inaudible]. ICANN [inaudible] just for your information, it is organized by [inaudible] but [inaudible] is not asking for funds. The RALOs asking for funds to participate in this event, which is organized by an ALS.

So I think this is a very, very big distinction and just for your information, [inaudible] is a sort of a meeting, which works under the Chatham House Rule, where many of the key player of ICANN of all other communities, constituencies – Thomas Schneider, for instance, Keith Drazek, even Fadi Chehade was there two times.

So this is actually very real and hard cross-community discussion can take place. It's not on the record, it's not being streamed, or there's no remote participation, and this makes the thing so unique and it will be of great value if also RALO representatives could participate in that one.

I mean, they did in the past, like either you're [involved], but this is more or less on their personal budget. But my main message is activities which are organized by ALSes, by individual ALSes, should not use the RALO budget request as a vehicle to get additional money. I don't think that's the right approach. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sandra, what in this tells you that this is an individual ALS looking at something to fund their own project? I'm not reading that. Maybe I'm missing [inaudible].

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I'm reading Maureen's comment, the organization that are running the summer school are APRALO ALSes, which is why the request was made, that's what [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, hold it. You're not talking about the augmented reality, then.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: No, I mean, I'm talking about the general. It's a general comment and I think this also applies to the activities requested for [Kinshasa]. I mean, this is also an activity for one country from one ALS as far as I understood that, but please correct me if I'm wrong.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. You're right and that's what we said about that one, but sorry. I'm trying to understand. I wasn't reading the chat so I thought you were talking about the NARALO request that's on the table right now.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: No. I'm talking more generally that ALSes should not use the RALO fund request as a vehicle to fund what they are doing.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think you're going to get a lot of people arguing with that here. I think most everyone will agree.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: On this one, Heidi, if it were me submitting it, I would not use the term "augmented reality." For those of you who are old enough, that sounds like this is a Tom Corbett whizzbang, we're going to do something in 3D with you have to wear glasses to use it. And I don't think that's what they're talking about, but that's the message that gets sent. So we may want to consider changing the title.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, Alan. Actually, no. That's sort of what it is. And in fact, within their request is a video that Glenn filmed on YouTube that shows Alfredo

demonstrating what augmented reality is, and you almost need to wear glasses.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, then maybe need to look at the video before Friday. If this is something, which is going to be generally useful to wide numbers of people, then I would strongly support it. If it requires you to spend \$300 on virtual reality glasses to use it, then clearly it's a different issue altogether. Tijani, you have your hand up. Sandra, I assume that's an old one.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Oh, yes. That's an old one. I will lower it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Alan, I have a question. Sandra said that the ALSes—

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a bad echo.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Do you hear me now better?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. So I said that Sandra said that ALSes doesn't have to make use of this funding because it is for RALOs and not for the ALSes. I don't understand it like this, I understand it as a funding for At-Large in general, and anyway, the RALO is the sum of the ALSes.

So this is why we ask the ALSes to make their request go through the RALO because if the RALO agree or support the project, the project becomes the project of the RALO. So I don't see how an ALS can ask for a funding for any project they have. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I think the issue is that if we're looking at very small amounts of funding, we might get it. If we're looking at large amounts of funding that are going to be of benefit to one ALS, it probably will not be accepted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Agreed with you. I agree, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, okay. That's the major issue I think we're talking about here.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And, of course, [inaudible] if one ALS in the world requests something, they may well get it. If 400 request things, it's going to kill it. But we're not there yet. All right, Heidi, anymore? We're really, really in a bad situation for time.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. That is it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. I think we're now well geared up. We have some work to do but we're well geared up for the Finance & Budget Committee. The next one is we were going to spend 20 minutes on ICANN 55. Are there issues that we have to do that we did not already do yesterday?

Since we're missing several of the ALT members anyway, we don't have the ability to do the full review we wanted to, and we're tight on time. Is there anyone on this call who has to leave almost immediately? We're already over the hour and a half.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, you cut out completely, so I know you were talking, but we don't know what you said.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I need to leave close to 9:00 [inaudible] so I can give you [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have ten more minutes. Maureen, you have your hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just to sort of say that I have to leave in about five minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Gisella, you've just heard the parameters. There's a couple of other items. We're not going to do the item that Olivier was going to present since he's not here. There is nothing really to review on the ALAC meeting unless other people have to, and I have about two minutes I want to talk about item number nine. So Gisella, you have about four or five minutes, I'm afraid. Go for it.

GISELLA GRUBER: I'll give you 45 seconds. Thank you, Alan, 45 seconds for Gisella here. Can everyone see the screen what I'm showing? I have made a few changes from last night because I've been scrolling a lot through sessions that have been added to the main schedule, and they will load up a few more between now and the end of the week, but I'll keep you all posted.

I just wanted to point out on the [inaudible] if anyone else is touching. On the Tuesday afternoon, we've got the ALAC session, work session

one and two, and I found a session called GAC and [CCWP] on ICANN's Corporate and Social Responsibility to Respect Human Rights. Just so that you are aware of that.

And Alan, we touched on this earlier on Wednesday and Thursday, the competitions, the CCT Review Team is meeting for the whole day on Wednesday, and the whole day on Thursday and our ALAC members on that are Kaili and Tim. Just to point that out. And on.

ALAN GREENBERG: This will be good experience for them to learn how to [inaudible] two meetings at once and we will manage.

GISELLA GRUBER: But I fortunately only got two. Some people usually have four, so it's a good start. We've got Wednesday afternoon just again to point out that there is the clash with the GNSO Council meeting, the ALAC with the Board. That's just mainly for the Board members not being able to go to the GNSO Council meeting.

But further down, we've got the Implementing Civil Society Engagement Working Session, which runs parallel to our wrap-up as well as the GNSO NextGen RDS where Holly and Alan are on that working group. And the CCT has a review team on that afternoon, as well.

Again, it's just to point things out so that when the main schedule comes out, that people are not too surprised. And I've just seen—

ALAN GREENBERG: Hold on. Gisella, I thought you said the CCT Review Team was all day Wednesday.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, it is all day Wednesday. That's a working session. Sorry, it was in the top one, and then they've got a general meeting, which may be presenting to the general public what they're doing. I don't have any further information, which is then after that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't see how we're going to fix it. We moved the wrap-up from Thursday because Thursday had disappeared on us, and now it's on Wednesday. Literally halfway through the week and I don't see it what we can do except hold it then. [inaudible] schedule around it.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. Wing it and see who can go where and maybe if you need to be somewhere, one of the vice chairs can maybe help out. And then recently just been added to the—

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, can you stay on Wednesday afternoon? Tijani has his hand up. Tijani, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Gisella, I have a big concern since I see that we have two ALAC working sessions programmed for Tuesday afternoon. And Tuesday afternoon you will have at least seven people from ALAC who will be absent. They will go on outreach outside the site. So I would see working group meetings at this time or something like this, but not an ALAC working session. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, would you like to respond to that?

ALAN GREENBERG: My only response is I don't see how we're going to do anything otherwise. Either we have productive sessions with some people missing, and we're going to have to work around that and schedule things appropriately, or we have two-thirds of the ALAC and regional leaders not doing anything in the afternoon. So Tijani, I don't see a way we have around it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I propose to keep all the working groups or all the regional general assemblies there in this afternoon. But not a working session of ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we managed to figure out how to do that. I'm going to go back to Gisella. Is that conceivable?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, yes. We need the final list of the people going to the Outreach and Engagement. I know that Sebastien, the French-speaking people, were listed. I know that Sebastien and Olivier were on the list. I think that Alan, that it will be nice if you would be able to go.

But where this stems from... Sorry? Yes, so [inaudible]. Where this stems from was when Leon did ask, I think it was Leon who asked for time during the ALAC sessions to discuss accountability, and this is where these timings... We said we would use these timings.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. People who will go, I propose and I still propose that Alan go to the outreach outside together with Cheryl, so the two English speakers will be Alan and Cheryl, and there will be four or five other French speakers who are... It's very easy to be Olivier, Sebastien, myself, Aziz, and perhaps, yes, perhaps someone from the Engagement Subcommittee from Africa. So I think that—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Daniel?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Daniel, yes. I think there is an important amount of people who will be outside and discussing accountability is something—

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to have to go on hold for a moment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So I continue. And discussing accountability without the whole people there, I think it is very important accountability. I don't know if you will have already ratified the proposal of the CCWG if it is ready. But if it be the [inaudible] of that, it will be a problem because we need all people there. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alan, I have my hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. I'm just wondering. We have discussed this, the need of the ALAC to continue with their work despite the outreach activities. So I don't know how we're going to solve all of the issues if we don't have some flexibility. One thing we could do is that we schedule some working

group updates during that time for the ALAC to hear from some of the working group chairs that are not present.

ALAN GREENBERG: You might as well schedule it as a vacation for the people who aren't presenting. I'm not sure how we're going to see our way through and solve this today.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Someone said something?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, sorry. That was my line.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's just we're getting to be, I think... I don't know if we want to take this on the list and try in the next 24 hours to whatever we want to come up with, but the schedule is going to close, and if I need to things, and I need to do it before the end of the week.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we need to present something, which is viable. If we have to move within our own slots, then they will accept it whether they like it or not. But yes, I think we have to come up with something before the end of the week. I don't quite know how to do that. Capturing someone who's involved in engage and outreach and Leon and me is going to be a challenge.

Can I ask to try to set up an hour to talk about this sometime? I don't know when.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alan, with ALT or?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Not necessarily with the ALT. Trying to get everyone at the same place is just not going to be possible. I think it's staff, me, Leon, Dev or Tijani or somebody from outreach.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're just not going to be able to satisfy everyone at this point, I don't think. We've been talking about this for quite a while. I'm not quite sure how it got to the point where it's a surprise to everyone. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Just to say that it is only to see how we can, if we can manage to bring all the working groups and the AGs, the general assemblies of the RALOs in this afternoon. This will solve the problem. If we cannot, you will see it is the possibility. If you cannot, we will make it as it is programmed now, but if we try, it will be better.

ALAN GREENBERG: The problem, Tijani, is we've already scheduled some of the working groups and general assemblies against competing meetings where a number of ALAC members could not be present. So those slots were already being used for other things where we couldn't have an ALAC meeting because a third of the ALAC or half of the ALAC is at the accountability session.

We'll look at it. This is not going to be perfect and I think we need to accept that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: But we'll look at it and see if we can do something. Go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Alan, to interrupt. Just again if I may, teething problems. This is the first Meeting A, we've got this big chunk of outreach, we've got the accountability still running, and we've got the whole of Monday taken

by various meetings. So the more we go, the less time we actually have to work. So I'll definitely set up a meeting with the people you mentioned before Friday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

GISELLA GRUBER: And last but not least, a three-hour CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 working session has now officially been added to the schedule on Thursday morning from 9:00 to 12:00, which means that all going well, we can still hold our ALT meeting from 8:00... No, sorry, the ALT meeting will now be from 7:00 to 9:00. And that's all from me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll leave it like that for the moment. When the agenda for that meeting gets published, we may well find that some of the normal accountability people can skip it, or skip parts of it, so we're going to look at that as we get closer.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay, thank you. Alan, just an idea when that's going to be? Because when the session closes, I've just got to, at this stage, we don't have services from 7:00 to 8:00. That's what meeting team is saying, that there's no AV tech people before 8:00, so I've got to negotiate that if we do want to start at 7:00.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why is it I get the feeling that people are conspiring to make our life more difficult instead of making it more easy? I can't avoid that feeling.

GISELLA GRUBER: It's true.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm used to new technology having problems, wherever new technology has you lose something important, but, okay. I'm going to get start something some things I shouldn't say and out loud in public on recording, if I'm not careful. Do we have anything else that we have to do today on this particular issue? We haven't talked about questions for the various groups. We haven't talked about any of the other things we should be. Please complete the survey and think of what... The GAC we will have a laundry, a standard laundry list. Discussion with the Board is the more critical one that I think we need to focus carefully on what it is we're going to be talking to them about. So we're not doing it right now.

Cheryl, I don't know what oh means. Oh, because it's true. Oh, I see, okay.

The only other item I had is item number nine and it says it all. We really have to get back to regular business. I certainly have to get back to regular business and I'm going to be doing my best to decrease the amount of time I'm focusing on the CCWG and try to reactivate some of the things we should have been doing months ago that we've let fall by the wayside.

I'd like everyone to look at the list and the fourth item of three question marks. I suspect there's a few other things that have fallen by the wayside that we need to reactivate. So I would appreciate input from anyone who knows what some of those are.

The Rules of Procedure update, by the way, is we're going to have to do one to address issues that were identified in the last Board member selection and it's probably a good time to correct some of the other problems that we've had, just small adjustments to just to fix things that we've identified as omissions or problems.

Yeah, I don't think it's going to be a substantive or controversial issue, but you never know in this group.

Anything else? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices. I turn you all free. Bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You will now be disconnected. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]