

2016

EN

YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of at-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings draft meeting, taking place on Thursday, the 21st of April 2016, at 14:30 UTC.

Our assembly today are Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cheryl-Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Harold Arcos, Daniel Nanghaka, Glenn McKnight, Siranush Vardanyan, Jimmy Schulz, Kaili Kan, Sebastien Bachollet, Alberto Soto, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Vanda Scartezini.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Excuse me?

ALAN GREENBERG: She said Vanda Scartezini.

YESIM NAZLAR: Oh. Apologies or that. We have apologies from Seun Ojedeji, Wolf Ludwig, Julie Hammer, Humberto Carrasco, Maritza Y. Aguero Minano, Judith Hellerstein, Tim Denton, Wafa Dahmani, and Ali AlMeshal.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

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.

2016

Finally, I'd like to remind everyone to state their names while speaking for the transcript purposes. Over to you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. You may wonder why we have called you together today. What we are going to be talking about, as I hope you all know – and I hope you've all read it already – is the proposal for multi-year planning of summits and general assemblies. I'll be going over some of the paper, but let me give you the overview of why this is important and I wish we had more people at this call.

This is arguably one of the more important documents we've ever submitted. We in At-Large believe that the general assemblies and summits are key to maintaining some level of continuity and interest in ICANN among our ALSes.

As we are currently funding them right now, things are not necessarily assured from year to year, and there's no real guarantee that the next Board, for instance, or the next CEO, will have the interest that past ones might have. So although there's no guarantees in life, just because we put it into a plan doesn't mean it's going to definitely happen. I think it's a very important step. ICANN is doing far more planning and – I won't use the term "budgeting" – detailed planning ahead of time, and then working to that plan. I think it's really important that we get into that process for this type of event. So it's important for our future, essentially.

2016

EN

The timeline we're on is very short. This document must be submitted by the end of next week. So it's been a long time coming, but we don't have a lot of time left. It's really important that everyone on this call – and I'll be sending out a message to those who aren't on the call – that everyone review the document and give us comments. As we go ahead, I'll identify some of the areas where comments are particularly relevant.

The one thing that this document is really missing and is going to be a showstopper in some people's minds is we have very little hard benefits. We have very little that we can document that we have gotten out of having general assemblies or the summits. We know in small number of cases – we may have a volunteer who became a more adamant volunteer because of the summit or because of the GA. If we can identify people – we're not going to name them in the document – but if we can identify a dozen really good volunteers we have right now – and we have the names even if we don't put them in the document – that came about largely because of these meetings. That would be really useful. It was 25, it would be better.

But anything we can do in terms of, from your regional perspective, what the real benefit has been other than we had a good party and people got to see a country they might not have seen before, it would be really useful in finishing up this document.

Cheryl, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

2016

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What you just said struck a chord with me in two ways. First of all, my immediate reaction to the show-stopping aspect of the hard data, the “show us your outcomes in clear, cold, analytical terms,” is: the same could be said for any ICANN public meeting. Show us any tangible benefit of any of those.

But following on from that knee-jerk reaction – and I still think it’s a valid reaction, by the way, and I don’t think many people would argue that we shouldn’t do public meetings – but showing the tangible cost benefit analysis there is probably going to be equally challenging.

It also resonated because, today in APRALO’s call, I made the observation that long-gone, luckily, but only recently, in terms of the last two years or so, are the days of us having a monthly meeting with a half a dozen or less At-Large Structures represented – and most of those [inaudible] the actual leadership team. Now, I don’t think we’d ever have anything in [lists] and double figures, but we sit around the 19 or 20. That may not be a lot, but it’s close to the 50% mark.

I think that significant change, which may not be easy to tie specifically to the act of having the assemblies – but I personally think it anecdotally would be because a number of these At-Large structures only started to become engaged in the regional work, for example, let alone the ICANN work, because of gathering and feeling confident and secure in the value that we place on their opinions through the general assemblies.

So, one somewhat glib response and one I hope is somewhat more useful. Thanks.

2016

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Let me be blunt. This is a call among friends. Or I hope. If we can stop that echo, I would appreciate it.

Within our community and within the ICANN community, we will find a range of positions. They range from, “How dare you ask me for return on investment? This is not a business,” to people who say, “If you cannot demonstrate the proof in the hard facts, then there isn’t any.” There are people, including Board members, who say, “We should have fewer face-to-face meetings for ICANN. We don’t really need them. There’s nothing we can’t do on a teleconference.”

So when I said hard facts would help, that’s exactly the word. It would help. There are some people, including some Board members, for whom hard facts will help convince. There are others who do not need them because they inherently understand we’re talking about people and communications and that it is not easy to translate it into hard facts.

So I was not trying to say that’s the only way we can get this sold. If we have to submit the paper as it is today, I would submit it, minus the typos, hopefully. But anything we can add, whether they are metrics or whether they are anecdotal of people who have been convinced or ALSes that are more active because they have seen things face-to-face, that would help. It’s a help, not a mandatory. Just to be clear.

Any other comments before I go dive into it?

2016

EN

Okay. The first part is an executive summary. We have deliberately at this point at currently half a page. It must not grow to more than a page. On the other hand, if there are parts that people believe are either there which are completely useless and not adding anything to giving the overview, please identify them. If there are things that you think are crucial things we need to bring to the front, then please identify those.

There are going to be significant people, including presumably a fair number of Board members, who only read the executive summary. Let's work on that assumption and make sure that it captures what we want to capture. As I said, right now it is pretty bare bones, but it does try to capture the whole little bit of history of why we're doing and what we want to come out this process.

I'm not keeping the eye on the hands. If anyone has one up – and I see Olivier does now – please, someone call out and let me know there's a hand up. Olivier, it's yours.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I wondered whether staff should not put the document on this screen. Or was there a reason for keeping the agenda on the screen?

ALAN GREENBERG: There was no reason in my mind. I hadn't looked at the screen. Now it's there, except we're at the end instead of the beginning. Oh, I see everyone has their own scroll.

2016

All right. I'm not going to say a lot more about it. I'm presuming every Board member will read the executive summary. I'm assuming everyone here will also. So look for things that are really extraneous and could be chopped out, and look for things that are missing.

The document, I believe, has been distributed just in PDF form. I will distribute a copy, or staff will – I don't remember who has it right now – in doc form. If you only have a small number of comments, it's a lot of easier to, of course, process them if you simply identify the line numbers and say what you want to change. But if you want to work on the whole document, then we will work from that as well.

Please do not recreate a doc file from the PDF. That causes all sorts of problems when trying to merge them together.

Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

We're not having an editing meeting now, are we? Please [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

I am not chairing an editing meeting. My phone will accidentally disconnect if this starts to be an editing meeting. Now, that doesn't mean someone can't say something's really missing, but we're not wordsmithing here.

2016

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Just because if we are, then my phone will disappear about the same time yours does.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I hope the people left have fun.

HOLLY RAICHE: So do I.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Background. Again, we have to presume that at least some of the people are on the Board are brand-new, are not particularly familiar with At-Large, and are certainly not familiar with how we work. Some of you may recall from an earlier ALAC Board meeting when a Board member suggested that, in addition to meeting at three ICANN meetings a year, that perhaps we should consider teleconferences.

Now, we probably had more teleconferences than anyone else in ICANN. We surely spend more on them with our translation. But nevertheless, things like facts don't necessarily get in the way of people's positions and how they understand things.

So the background starts off by pointing out how many people travel and reiterating the fact that we have said multiple times before that, for the vast majority of At-Large people – and there's less than a handful that I can think of that don't meet this model – if ICANN doesn't provide the funding, people don't show up. There are a couple of people who

2016

EN

have other aspects of their life which will allow them to come to ICANN meetings, even if they weren't funded by At-Large travel support, but it's limited to that.

So that's a really important an issue because, if you look at things like the Registrars or Registry Stakeholder Group, they have people coming to these meetings who are not funded. The presumption is everyone is in that model. So the first paragraph is attempting to set that record straight. I'm sure it will not convince everybody.

We go onto a little bit of a history of At-Large in that, again, someone coming into ICANN now may assume that the whole concept of At-Large, [with] RALOs and ALSes, has existed since the start of time, and that is not the case. There was a time when the ALAC was largely appointed by the Board. There were no ALSes. There were no RALOs. So that's been built up over time.

It goes into a little bit of the history of how that happened. There's a parenthetical comment somewhere, saying, "Once we had the RALOs, ICANN staff stopped working with these people," because, again, in this world of GSC, with hundreds of people on the ground around the country, people forget that, just a few years ago, there were none, with the exception of the people in the U.S. or a few people in offices in Brussels and, at that point, Sydney. So, again, history is not going to make the case, but it's important that people understand that there's been a huge revolution, and we're trying to make it work.

2016

That brings us up to roundabout Line 47 right now, for those of you who want to scroll, up to the first summit. Prior to the summit, there had been what were equivalent to general assemblies. I'm not sure they were used with that term because, in some cases, the representatives of prospective or new ALSs were brought together to help write the various formative documents – the principles of operation/rules and procedure – and in some cases, that was all done remotely. In other cases, it was done with face-to-face meetings.

For each of the RALOs, there was an opportunity to sign the memorandum of understanding with ICANN, where all of the representatives of ALSs, or most of them, were brought to an ICANN meeting for a formal signing. That may or may not have been the time at which the RALO came into existence, but there was at least one where they were all brought together.

There was a belief that should continue, but it's unclear how we would be funding it or how it would be handled. What we decided to do – and maybe I want to turn it over to Cheryl for a minute to go into how the summit came about – is bring together representatives of all the ALSes at the time, of which there were about 100, and I think about 80 came to the meeting in Mexico City. That became the first summit.

I don't think the term "ATLAS" was used at that point. At least I don't remember it being used.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. It was not.

2016

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: But after the fact, At-Large Summit became ATLAS. Cheryl, can you give a couple of sentences about the rationale for how it came about and how we convinced people to fund it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: First of all, yes, it was called the ATLAS from the beginning – At-Large Summit.

ALAN GREENBERG: Really? I never heard it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it was the shorthand used in our planning meetings. It was a consequence of how the quite extensive – and it was extensive – workup and planning was [inaudible]. It became rather amusing to a number of us, that the concept is holding the world of ICANN on the shoulders of the ALSes. It was viable image, and the whole usage of ATLAS and the demigod activity associated with that name came to bearing from then, in preparation. There was also a whole lot of other fluffy bit, like the colors that were selected by the RALOs, etc., etc., and indeed the logo that we currently use today.

Now, all of that is all very nice, but how we got to happen was with a lot of extremely tense and quite hotly contested and debated discussion with particularly the ICANN Board. But also we had to convince key

2016

leadership and stakeholders in the other parts of the ICANN community, who I can assure you were far from enthusiastic at the considerable expenditure that bringing together a single representative from each of our ALSes, our At-Large Structures, was, as they had then been formed into the regional organization. It was a [inaudible], considerable expenditure. It was, at the time, a somewhat unheard of expenditure, and it took an awful lot of convincing by the leadership of the ALAC for that to even be considered by the ICANN Board.

It was very much a bilateral discussion to begin with, until proof of concept was agreed to, that we would like at having such a meeting. It was also a time when there was a great deal of morphogenesis or change in how ICANN was doing things. A number of the constituencies and component parts of at least the GNSO I think somewhat belatedly but eventually realized that having such a thing as an At-Large Summit for the At-Large Structures – which, remember at that time, many parts of ICANN literally did not understand what it was all about and why anything beyond their own views within their own support organization was at all useful or [essential].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]. We just lost her.

ALAN GREENBERG: Finished. We'll have to assume the former. All right. Let me give a little bit more background as to the world we were living in at that point because I think it's important to understand it.

2016

We were coming out of a world where there was no difference between At-Large and ALAC. Nowadays, we are continually hammering on especially new leadership in ICANN to understand the difference between ALAC and At-Large. At that point, there wasn't any. The interim ALAC was 15 people, ten of whom were appointed by the Board because there were no RALOS. Five of whom were appointed by the NomCom were At-Large, with a couple of ALSes coming on board, which didn't really have any connection to anything. And they tended to be the ALSes that were created by the ALAC members at the time.

If I had to use a single word to describe ALAC in the 2007 and '08 timeframe, it's very simple. It's a four-letter word. It's "joke." It was pandering to the U.S. government, who wanted users involved, and allowing us to have words that said users are involved. But they really didn't do anything. Sorry, that's not true. They did do things. They were viewed as not doing anything.

This is two years later now, and we had turned the world around enough to convince senior people in ICANN that there was something outside of the ALAC and that we needed to get them involved.

Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. Just to remember one main point at this time: there was no budget. When I left the Board and that went to the ALAC, the first thing I needed to do was talk with the people from ICANN to have a budget

2016

for us because there was no budget. Nobody had submitted any budget. So it was really just a group of people. There was no structure.

So from 2007, they started with structure, all of the [formers], all of the things. I do believe that it is important for the history that the first budget was done with ICANN in 2008.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Vanda. Clearly, ICANN evolved. When At-Large was first created as the interim ALAC, the intent was to bring those people to one meeting, and then they would bring ALAC meeting to any meeting again. That sounds funny right now, but that really was the plan. There was a lot of work done at that point – we’re talking about in the 2003 timeframe – to convince ICANN to fund the 15 ALAC members to come to meetings. Of course, in later years, we eventually, once the RALOs existed, added in regional leaders. But it’s been a progression as we’ve gone forward.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. So we did get the next [Mexican] City summit funded, and it was by all accounts a success. We realized, of course, that the effort involved and the money involved was not something that was going to happen very often. We did, however, there would be another summit sometime, and we eventually came up with this concept of a summit

2016

every five years, and in the four intervening years, or at least three out of the four years, we would have general assemblies in each of the regions. If you consider the summit a general assembly for everyone, that means – you’re not necessarily evenly spaced because if you look at the actual history, you’ll find in some cases the general assembly and the summit for any given region are quite close from each other or quite far part. But it seemed to be something which we could convince people that it should be funded, and it has been moderately successful.

Any questions?

So that’s basically where we are right now. We have gone through one full cycle. We’ve had two summits, five years apart. We did manage to have five regional assemblies in between those. One of them was not at an ICANN meeting, but it did meet the criteria for a general assembly. I think there’s a general feeling right now that, although there are some merits to having a meeting somewhere else, much of the justification in this paper is that the meeting should be at an ICANN meeting. So to the extent possible, I think that’s where our focus is going to be going forward, and it certainly is in this paper.

The next section we’re talking about is trying to convince people about the importance of face-to-face meetings, and I’m going to turn it over to Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Alan. Indeed, the whole paper is actually based on three main pillars. The first one is the one that face-to-face meetings

are very, very important, and especially in our community. Alan has given lots of reasons for that, including the one that is, of course pretty much none of the people in our community have any alternative way to be funded to go to face meetings, or none of the people in our community have a direct relationship with the domain name business as such. So if you don't bring people face-to-face, you're just going to have people walk away after a short while.

The second pillar is the need for multi-year funding, and the third pillar is the recognition that there is a certain pattern that takes place that has gone on between the first summit and the second summit and that we're now seeing as well with the third summit. So we really are pushing towards having this pattern continue.

Now, let's go back to the importance of the face-to-face meetings. I think that in there we tried to really look at the various reasons, first mentioning the volunteer body, but also really pushing for the fact that we are a very diverse geographical entity as such.

That introduces also some problems for our community, the first one being that, of course, we have language and cultural issues, but the bigger one being that the earth is round. So if we conduct all of our business in conference calls, we're going to end up with calls that will clash with either the middle of the working day for some people, or the middle of the night for others. That is not ideal. You need to have one location that you can meet face-to-face in and have everyone awake at the same time, and hopefully getting some sleep at the same time as well. So that was one very important part in there.

There is also the whole point of the skills gap, the fact that you do learn a lot faster when you actually attend an ICANN meeting than if you just learn about it in books or if you're following it remotely. It's one of the things that you have to experience. Certainly, to be able to sustain the knowledge and the skills that we have in our community, we need regular face-to-face meetings that bring those people new, fresh, blood, if you want, into the equation that will be able to take on those positions of those people that are then moving or that have other things to do.

That also recognizes the fact that there is a lot more going on in our world than there used to be a while ago. I think that, certainly, the At-Large community has [come and done a lot more processes] than it has in the past. It's involved in a lot more threads, including now also being involved with some individuals in the GNSO Working Groups and PDP Working Groups. So there is a need to replenish that supply and have more people join us.

There's also in there a mention of the opportunity for networking. What do people, what do At-Large members, take out of this whole At-Large community? Are they just interested in saving the world, or is there also some other side to it? I think that, certainly, the opportunity for networking is something that has been very helpful for many of our members: being able to share their view and share address books, I guess, with other people that are from around the world and maybe in the same field of work that they are in outside of ICANN as well. So that's an important incentive for volunteers.

2016

Finally, the final bullet in this “Why face-to-face meetings are important.” it’s down to the exposure of the workings of ICANN. It’s the whole combination of the workings of ICANN on one side, which do allow you to meet a large number of people around the world. But at the same time, it’s also this mix between geography, new people, and people that have been around for a while. That stuff is really important.

I don’t know if we’ve missed any other points in there, and I would certainly at this stage be very happy to hear any further suggestions as to what other advantages we could put in there for face-to-face meetings.

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a thought. We probably as a group have enough diverse interest that we would not necessarily as a group meet in the way that, say, registries probably all know each other. They probably all deal with each other – and with registrars. There’s not the same kind of reason that a lot of us would otherwise get together. I don’t know if that’s worth adding as another point, but I was just looking at the first point. It’s a volunteer body, and with volunteers who don’t necessarily share the same interest in domain names, who may come at from very different perspectives, and not otherwise have the same reason for knowing each other that the industry does.

I’m not sure that that’s worth it, but there you go.

2016

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Holly. Well, the first two bullet points are saying this: what you're saying. The first bullet point is saying 100% volunteer body. The second one is saying no commercial interest in domain names.

When you mentioned the opportunity for networking that contracted parties might have, it's a tricky issue. I have discussed with registries and registrars because we have to remember that they are competitors as well. Some of them are fierce competitors and hate each other's guts, I've found out quite shockingly so, actually, thinking they're all a cabal of domain people. But, no. No, no, no. There's some strong points there that go away beyond ICANN meetings.

So although we have to recognize that, yes, there is actually an ICANN-run domains-type forum that takes place, where ICANN meets with contracted parties without us riffraff being around – that's a fact that's there – not the riffraff, but the fact that the industry meets without everyone else. That already is in place, and although there are some domain forums that take place around the world, which they can use to network in, I'm not sure that we should specifically mention the contracted parties in this respect.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

2016

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But I see that Alan has got his hand up. Maybe he has a different view. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Actually, my view has evolved as you were talking. I put my hand up to point out that the first two bullets are separate bullets, but as was mentioned earlier in the document, we are volunteers to a large extent different from many other volunteers in ICANN. Volunteers come in certainly various flavors and colors and in how passionate they are. There are certainly volunteers – and the best example I'll give is Chuck Gomes. He works for Verisign. He is paid to be here. He puts far more hours and passion and care into what he does here than anyone could ever require of an employee.

So it's not a simple fact that, yes, registries or other people are paid to be here. The same could be said for people in a lot of other parts of ICANN. Yes, technically they are working in the industry, but they also care a lot. But they do have some level of funding, and that makes a significant difference.

The other thing that we didn't bring up – and I'm not sure we should; I guess I look for input – is, as Olivier mentioned, ICANN does hold meetings for registrars and registries to meet periodically. The non-contracted party house of the GNSO several times has met in plenary sessions between ICANN meetings. So the kind of thing we're talking about is not unique to us, and I think we probably need to bring that out somewhere. Thank you.

2016

EN

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Alan. Perhaps you can think of where to put this. Let's not have a decision right here and no, but if anybody thinks where that could be put, that certainly is something we need to mention somewhere.

Okay. Any other comments? Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

What Alan said is something I was going to bring up a little later [besides] putting it into the chat. It is a consequence of even the first ATLAS summit in Mexico, but certainly of the consequence general assemblies and the second summit that the expectation and validation of the plenary meeting exercises has in fact, I think, been easier for other parts of ICANN to then get funded and supported. I think we could actually state the hypothesis that it is because of the clear and resounding success of engaging our diverse – one could say, most diverse – community of volunteers in the role of acting in the best interests of Internet end users through our At-Large movement and the associated general assemblies and summits that has been the proof of concept for such activity to now be supported in other component parts of ICANN. I doubt that other than perhaps small sponsoring by interested parties of things like networking events for parts of the

2016

particular constituencies just within the two support organizations that are interested in the G and the C space would ever occur, other than based on what I think is a good model that our [assemblies] have developed. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl.

There's an echo again. Testing, one two three.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. We've got a few more things to add on there. Any other points for this section? I think staff has captured some of the points and we'll certainly listen to the recording afterwards to add a couple more points in there, but I don't see anyone with any more points for this section.

The next session after that, section four looks at the need for the multi-year planning. That's something that we have been asking for a very long time. We've asked for multi-year budgets, and the ICANN finance department has pushed back on multi-year budgets for many years, because that's just not the way that they work.

They work on a budget that works year on year and is separate. That said, of course, I think there was somehow this misunderstanding

2016

perhaps where we were basically meaning multi-year planning when the finance department was hearing multi-year budget, and indeed, Alan has said many times that when one looks at any significant investment in anything to do with ICANN, there are often multi-year planning that needs to take place for these. Is that correct? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It goes farther than that. Xavier has often said that the difference between planning and budgeting is budgeting actually commits the expense, whereas planning is just blue sky planning, and to be honest, that is very disingenuous, which is the kind way of saying it's not true. ICANN makes long-term commitments past the fiscal year often. Now, we are not in a position to forecast our income five years in advance, and we don't make commitments for our whole budget five years in advance, but I sure hope we're renting building premises for more than a year at a time, and I hope we're committing to the building for July prior to June 30th, because it would just be ludicrous in any real world to say we're not doing any commitment of resources years ahead of time.

We have now scheduled ICANN meetings three years out, something we used to do and haven't done for a while, but we are now. That's making financial commitments. There are penalties associated with backing out or with changing things. We accepted several hundred million dollars from new gTLD applicants with a commitment to spend the money on the program. So we spend money, we commit money ahead of time multi-years all the time. It's not our full budget, but let's not pretend

2016

that we don't do any commitments, we're just asking to be put in that category too. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan, and as Cheryl mentions in the chat, this is planning and commitment to expenditure. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. I'm sorry, I was muted. As Olivier said, it is multi-year planning and not multi-year budget, and I understand very well what Alan said. They are always working like this, it means that they plan for multi-year things, but their immediate commitment is for the budget. Of course, if the next year there is something that will prevent them to budget what was planned previously, they were not budgeted. That's the meaning of we don't commit. They don't commit 100% if you want, but it's a commitment when they plan. So I think that we can go with multi-year planning. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Tijani. I'll go through the bullet points swiftly. This section is really into two parts. The first part of this section is looking at the problems that are arising due to the fact that we don't have multi-year planning, and it goes quite deeply into them. And then the second part goes into the positives, if you want. If we went for multi-year planning, what would that result in? Effectively, it kind of shows you

what the problems are, what problems are caused, and then find a solution to end up on a happy, positive note.

The various problems that have been identified are particularly – the first one is the predictability of it all. For the ALAC, for the RALOs, for ICANN staff, everyone. There is a lack of predictability in our own planning for our own strategy and how we work, which is very difficult, when we have no idea whether there's going to be a face-to-face meeting in the next year or not. That, of course, includes the problem of organizing the first ICANN meeting of the fiscal year. If one was to have a face-to-face meeting in October and one just has two or three months to prepare for that, it's very short indeed. There's the first thing that was mentioned, the predictability for the ICANN finance, and ICANN board seemed to be important as well. If we'd suddenly drop a request for \$700,000, that certainly is going to make an ICANN budget quite different from the usual budget that doesn't have such a request, so being able to plan for this in advance can only be a good thing.

Thirdly, the point is made to do with the five-year cycle, the fact that we are constantly working on this using this cycle, but the problem is we keep on having new board members, new staff, new volunteers and sometimes we think we're continually faced with explaining the entire pattern, its history, benefits, requirements over and over again. It feels like a repeat.

The fourth point in there is to do with the limited budget planning cycle and the uncertainty of success until the very last moment. A summit takes a very long time to put together. We took nearly a year last time,

and I think previously, the first summit also took six to eight months to prepare, if not more. We can't just ask for a summit and have it three months later, so that was one additional point.

Finally, on this page, it's the amount of time that is needed by volunteers and by staff to create each time requests for these summits and for these general assemblies. We're just not working smartly here. We're doing something that is repetitive and that somehow is just not bound to work too well in this fashion.

So these are the negatives, the positives – and I'll come to you in a second, Alan. These are all the negatives. The positives, why would a multi-year planning be better? Obviously, you take any of the points that we've made before and you say the counterpoint. So certainly, more financial predictability for ICANN at all levels, both at the RALO level, at the ALAC level but also at the ICANN finance level.

They know that a summit would be coming up in two years' time, you can prepare for it, you can certainly prepare financially, you can actually have a bigger picture view of what are the major plans in the specific year way ahead of these plans being filed by the different parts of ICANN. That really is something that we see as being very helpful. Certainly, the ability of everyone concerned to be able to plan in time, including planning for a summit – which as we said takes a year – is important when you know that this is going to be on the table a year from now.

2016

Preparing the community for these general assemblies or a summit is very important, and the worst thing is to tell them “Yes, we're going to have a general assembly and such and such a meeting, if we get the funding,” and then we don't get the funding, they don't get the general assembly and it certainly doesn't instill much confidence in many of our community.

And then finally, looking at the overall efficiency, the volunteer morale and cooperation. This whole thing of having something that is multi-year and that is planned in advance with a view to the future is something that certainly would bring confidence to our community, in knowing that the next meeting is coming up at such and such date, etc. Alan, I'm probably rambling, but you have the floor now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Two comments. One related to the section, one not, but I just want to capture it before we go on. Later in the section, that last bullet on volunteer and staff time I think is really weak. I'm not sure if we want to delete it or strengthen it. Although yes, if we had commitment ahead of time, it would make life a little bit easier, but we're still going to have to do planning and specific requests for funding any given year, so it's not clear that the work is really a lot more – certainly a lot easier on our tension, but I'm not convinced that the actual workload is that different, so we may want to rethink that.

On a general sense, I realize what is missing, and I made the somewhat interesting comment earlier that a director once suggested we hold

2016

EN

teleconferences. I think we probably want to document in this paper that we do do a very significant amount of intersessional work between ICANN meetings. Again, someone who's not familiar with what we're doing may not realize the scope of the work. As an example, we talk about the CCWG or the CWG and there were 60 or 70 meetings that were held. That's a very impressive number. Among our five RALOs, we have almost that many monthly meetings a year, and that's not considering any of our working groups or any of our seminars, webinars or things like that.

So I'm going to suggest to the staff that we try to put together some statistics very quickly, perhaps for calendar year 15, which is an easy one that's relatively different, and just try to capture the number of meetings, and to the extent that we can, even estimate the total number of people that are attending these meetings. I think it's going to be a very impressive number, and point out that we're not simply saying "Give us travel money because that's the only way we can get anything done." Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Alan. I think that would work for section three, is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably. It's either section three or preamble to section three which justifies section three. I'm not quite sure where it fits, but we'll find a good place to put it.

2016

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks, and just turning over to staff, I don't see that being an action item, but Ariel, you've got this?

ALAN GREENBERG: It will be an action item regardless of whether they write it or not.

ARIEL LIANG: I just captured it in the [pot].

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll work with staff and try to make sure it's a task which is not impossible and doesn't generate too much load but gets some useful data quickly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. Just following on from Alan's points, and he started to make a point I was going to make later as well. Before I go to the details of supporting and also giving some – where you might find some of these statistics to make that action item easier to implement, I think another thing we could put in somewhere in section three, and indeed probably allude to it in the executive summary, is the fact that over the

2016

EN

last ten years – and we can sort of talk in that timeframe, because it's about that long since summits are being on the agenda and etc. – across a number of industry and interest sectors globally, the role of – in their vernacular, the customer, but in our vernacular the customer and Internet end-user, so we've got the registrants and indeed the greater, wider Internet, significantly interested parties – and you can use that term I think [inaudible] has changed.

We have, for heaven's sake, even the banking and insurance industries now having a customer focus, which is vastly different to what it was only five years ago, let alone ten years ago, so the value and importance of having these gatherings, opportunities and all the positives that you've outlined [seeps] into that I think, and probably makes ICANN arguably a leader – and I'll feel good about that – in terms of industry best practice of engagement with their consumer and end-user groups. Make better words out of it, but that's something I thought that was probably worthwhile bringing to the fore.

In terms of helping with the action item, I think it is important that we show how much intersessional work happens, because it is something that not everyone will necessarily be aware of, but one of the places you may find some of that – and I'd also mention how much work happens at an ICANN meeting in general – is at our reports. Our reports are often completed, presented and not really read or gone into the details of far beyond those of us who are fascinated by these metrics or who are presenting it, but right back to Chairman of the At-Large Advisory Committee in 2003 and beyond, we've reported to the wider

2016

community on the activities of the ALAC and At-Large, and there has been a clear and demonstrable growth.

Things like the number of actual public policy and policy development input pieces that have come out, there's been an exponential growth in the number of capitalist [statements] that happened intersessionally for the general working ICANN. It's gone from looking very much at self-structure and self-organizational activities to being an integral and essential part of the cross-community work at ICANN. We should also remember to – as Alan said – put some of the human hours that are involved in the regional, and of course even some of the At-Large structure activities which benefit ICANN as well.

I also would suggest that we do remember that as we go into an internationalized and globally accountable entity to be able to demonstrate that ICANN is committed to the individuals that are affected by the outcomes of its policy development work and discussions by fostering and encouraging our At-Large structures, and indeed individual members who are interested, to continue to learn is vital, so we can probably close the circle to some extent in summary there as well. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl, that's a lot of information here, but we've hopefully captured most of it. I'm sure we'll have to resort to the recording again a little bit on this. Next is Holly Raiche.

2016

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a thought, if we are using as a metric the number of hours that Alan suggested based just on APRALO meetings, other RALO meetings, ALAC, ALAC executive, there is an unquantifiable additional time if you think that the hours that all of us, including non-ALAC or the GNSO stuff, for the ICANN stuff... I'm not suggesting you try to quantify it, but just put in the untold hours that everybody else has put in apart from ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I'm not sure how we can quantify that exactly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier, I think it's too difficult, but I think some of the hours that were massively put in for the whole IANA thing, there is some quantity there, and then just say. "And there's an almost unquantifiable time that is put in the various GNSO working groups," and leave it there, because I don't know a simple way of doing this, frankly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Holly. Do you think that we need to have this? Because I'm starting to be a bit concerned we're adding a lot more things, and does that actually strengthen our message or does this somehow dilute our message?

2016

HOLLY RAICHE: It falls onto the point Alan was making, which is ICANN may not be aware of the amount of time and effort that all of us put in, not just to ALAC but to ICANN generally. In the scheme of thing, if you don't think it matters, fine, but if we are using it as a strong point, then let's just indicate that the hours that people put in are more than just ALAC stuff, and I guess make up your mind on whether that's strength or not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Holly. I think that actually makes sense in that we have been – we as in the ALAC and At-Large – have been accused in the past of coming to ICANN meetings, meeting in our own room but never mixing or mingling with any of the rest of the community, and that clearly is not the case. If at all, our community mixes and mingles more and is involved with more processes than anybody else out there, because we are cross cutting, and we do take part in GNSO working groups, so that's a good point that you're making on this.

Let's go down the queue, let's have Vanda Scartezini next.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. In the same sense, I would like to add the directed advantage for all AC, for the other AC, for the GAC, and all SO members to know ALS members from their areas. I could say here after London how RACLARO helped many registrars, many CCs and even ICANN to talk around and spread word about what is going on, even helping governments to understand and encourage them to participate.

2016

That is, in my opinion, quite important, because those people from the ALS, they are in the root [inaudible] and they talk with everybody. They are a nonprofit organization, they dedicate time for other people, so there is a lot of things they are helping now. The whole ICANN community, not only us. Just adding more information about what Holly has said.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: This is direct, and many people inside the Board, they have opportunities to talk with. I said, wow, this is not for us. A lot of people in Latin America are working for the new gTLD's information, convincing people that maybe they're needed by someone, so they have direct ingress on the areas for other ACs and SOs.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Vanda. I see support from Sirnush Vardanyan and also from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to what you just said. I think that would fit well in section number three, why the face-to-face meeting is important. You have really hit the nail on the head here. That's also a question that one is often asked, is that what's the worth of having At-Large around and having your ALS representatives around, and that answers the question. If you certainly have seen a synergy going on because of the fact that they came to London, that's a definite win, and

2016

it's a win not only for At-Large, it's obviously a win for these other organizations and for the other parts of ICANN, so that's a good point.

Next is Alan Greenberg. Alan, you might be muted, having a wonderful conversation with yourself.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Very well now.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't change anything, I just pushed the same button that was pushed previously. Vanda raises a good point and we do have to include it, I suspect there are a moderate number of GAC members and ccTLD members who first found out about it prompted to it based on either At-Large people or fellowship people who have become acquainted with ICANN. I'm not sure we can collect those kind of statistics, but we may want to allude to them in some vague way.

In terms of Holly's comment on we don't want to spend too much time on this, on how many hours we've put in, I think there's some staff time that's going to be needed. The actual part of the paper is going to be a sentence or so, so I don't think we're going to be cluttering up the paper with this. I'll point out that in Steve Crocker's New York Times op-ed piece the other day basically saying the U.S. better do the transition, he

2016

EN

quoted numbers of hours of conference calls, e-mails and things like that. Those are good numbers to impress people if things are serious. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. We still have Vanda's hand still up.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, sorry, I'm out of the computer.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll put up my chair hand and notice we have less than 20 minutes and we still have some paper to go through.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan, and I think that we've gone through the two sections, three and four, the need for multi-year planning. I don't see any other hands up for additions to this, so we can move on to the proposal, and it's over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. The proposal is relatively short because we're not trying to belabor the point. If they accept it in concept, we'll then have to figure out how to actually do it, but there's no point in planning really large details. We are summarizing here the way we envision here the concept of a five-year plan, starting after a summit and continuing, but

2016

typically we can imagine a year with no general assemblies. This gives us some time to recover, this gives us some time to start implementing things that came out of the general assembly, and then we're looking out at the next three years, years two, three and four. We have the five assemblies, so clearly, we're looking at probably two, two and one or something like that, trying to avoid having a general assembly too close into the summit, and then the summit.

It's a relatively modest plan. If you looked at the next page, which is the timeline – not next page, let's skip ahead to the diagram, which doesn't come out in this. No way we can shrink it? It doesn't really matter.

This timeline goes basically into this fiscal year. It does demonstrate that at this point, there was one general assembly, the one in Dublin at the beginning of this year, and hopefully there will be four more in the next couple of years to allow us to finish the full cycle of five.

The format attempts to show the pattern, and you'll note for instance if you look at the general assemblies for Asia Pacific, we have between Mexico City and the next one there's a four-year gap and a one-year gap. They're not all evenly split. Some of them, like Latin America, Caribbean, it's almost in the middle, but clearly since we're subject to the rotation of ICANN meetings and availability of funding, that we really don't have a lot of options, but it does mean people get together with some level of regularity. It's not a perfect system, but it's something that's manageable. We could gain the same thing for instance by having a general assembly every two to three years. The cost would be higher, the amount of work would be higher and I don't

2016

EN

think we could sustain it, so this is a good compromise for going forward.

The diagram by the way – thanks to Dev Anand Teelucksingh who did the first version of that and convinced me I had to learn how to use Google Docs to do diagrams to finish the rest of it – but I think it illustrates the pattern without too much clutter. But if anyone has any tweaking suggestions, we might consider them.

So the conclusions and next steps, which is the page before this I think, or maybe the page after, I'm not sure which, is basically summarizing we have been carrying out this plan for the last seven years now, so we're talking about since 2009, 2008 including the planning of it, and it sort of worked, but we're the equivalent of hand to mouth eating, that everything is done on a short term and that's not good for ICANN budgeting, it's not in line with how ICANN does its overall planning right now, because they are doing five-year planning and try not to have surprises like summits coming up in other parts of their existence, and we're simply suggesting that we roll this into the standard ICANN multi-year operational planning It already fits within the strategic planning, I believe, and that we simply go forward and make this business as usual.

At that point, I have not a lot else. We've gotten a lot of really good suggestions. I was a little bit dubious this meeting was going to be useful, but I think from my point of view, it has been exceedingly useful in that we've identified a number of things that are important issues that were left out of this paper, and I think we have a handle on it now that we should be able to get a new version out by early next week, and

2016

then the final version out by the end of the week, in time to submit it to the budget plan. I see two hands, Olivier and Cheryl. I don't know what order they came in, so we'll take Olivier first.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan, let's have Cheryl first, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I shall jump in. I've been multitasking, as I do, and I've just finished reviewing another entire document while I've been working with you on this one, and there's something that is a quote that I thought we might use in another aspect of ICANN activities in terms of behaviors at meetings. There's a part of this catch line that I wanted to share with you, Olivier, because I think it might be something we can use perhaps as a lead-in sentence, that's just something I want to use later on in our work on meeting behavior expectations, I the following quote from actually the banking industry, and it says to keep working hard to make sure we have the right culture, the right practices and the right behaviors in place, while having general assemblies with our At-Large structures is a foundation to that in a grassroots, bottom-up consensus development model. Thank you.

2016

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you there, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I certainly am, I was waiting for our venerable Chair to...

ALAN GREENBERG: You turned it over to Cheryl, so I thought you were going to take it back.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine, thanks. Cheryl, that's a great quote. If you could e-mail it over to Alan and I, that would be great, we can add it in there. I like the banking industry has always come up with some fantastic themes, and they've certainly got the money to pay for some good marketing people, so I like to have the cultural part is the one that sounded really cool. To keep working hard to make sure we have the right culture. That's priceless. I'm not kidding, it's a good one, so we should add this on there.

What I was going to say was to add one more thing, which is that this document is not only geared at the board, but this document I believe is going to be the document that will also be shared in case of any public comment, and I think that one of the things that as we're seeing now, the community veto of the budget becoming a reality in the next rounds, I am sensitive to the fact that this document is going to be shared with all of the SOs and ACs, and I would say that the biggest hurdle to us moving forward with this document and the Board moving

2016

EN

forward with it will be the response that we get from other supporting organizations and advisory committees.

We need to think of a plan to first present it to them. We also need, when we read this, to not only think in terms of how a Board member would react, but also how a community member from outside the ALAC and At-Large community would respond, so I invite you to have a final look at it before we finalize this paper, so that we're sure that we're not working counterproductively, if you want, when it comes down to working with the other supportive organizations, advisory committees and stakeholder groups. That's all I needed to say, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Any other comments before we adjourn a few minutes early? As I said, I think it's been a very productive and useful meeting, so I thank those who have taken the trouble to attend and to contribute.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: No further comments? Cheryl, I need you for five minutes. Can I convince you to stay up for another few minutes?

2016

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I've actually put that quote into the chat. I hope it got through to the chat so it's all in one space with other comments that have come in, because my AC crashed just as I pressed send. Let me know if it didn't come through.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do not see it, actually.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Of course not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, you didn't need to tell her that. You should have said "Yes we've got it, don't worry."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I wasn't planning on resending it.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was about an hour and ten minutes into the time, we'll get it from the transcript or from the reporting.

2016

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. You want me to stay on the line or you want to call me back, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll Skype or telephone you, just tell me which.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, Skype or telephone?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

YESIM NAZLAR: The meeting is now adjourned, thanks very much for your participation. You will now be disconnected. Have a lovely day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]